

## Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism

# HANDBOOK OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

## HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK

### SECTION TWO

### INDIA

*edited by*

J. Bronkhorst  
A. Malinar

VOLUME 22/6

# Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism

Volume VI:  
Index

*Edited by*  
Knut A. Jacobsen  
(*Editor-in-Chief*)

*Associate Editors*  
Helene Basu  
Angelika Malinar  
Vasudha Narayanan



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2015

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Brill's encyclopedia of Hinduism / edited by Knut A. Jacobsen (editor-in-chief); associate editors, Helene Basu, Angelika Malinar, Vasudha Narayanan.

p. cm. — (Handbook of oriental studies. Section three, India, ISSN 0169-9377; v. 22/6)

ISBN 978-90-04-26555-4 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Hinduism—Encyclopedias. I. Jacobsen, Knut A., 1956- II. Basu, Helene. III. Malinar, Angelika.

IV. Narayanan, Vasudha.

BL1105.B75 2009

294.503—dc22

2009023320

ISSN 0169-9377

ISBN 978 90 04 26555 4

Copyright 2015 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands. Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Global Oriental and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

# Table of Contents, Volume VI

## Prelims

Table of Contents, Volumes I–VI .....	vii
Preface .....	xvi
List of Editors and Contributors .....	xvii
Notes for Users .....	xx
Primary Sources .....	xxii
Primary Source Abbreviations .....	lvi
Journals and Series .....	lxv
General Abbreviations .....	lxxviii
Narmadā .....	3
Śaiva Texts .....	10
Lay Śaivism .....	10
Initiatory Śaivism .....	11
Chronology .....	11
The Atimārga .....	12
The Mantramārga .....	14
The Saiddhāntika Scriptures .....	14
The Saiddhāntika Exegesis .....	14
The Siddhānta's Pratiṣṭhātantras and Pratiṣṭhāpāddhatis .....	18
Saiddhāntika Liturgical Hymnography .....	18
The Scriptures of the Non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga .....	18
Classifications of the Mantramārga's Scriptures .....	20
The Non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga's Exegesis .....	23
The Kulamārga .....	28
Exegetical Literature of the Kulamārga .....	32
Salvific Alchemy and Procedures for Victory in Battle .....	33
Pratyabhijñā and Spandapratyabhijñā .....	34
Non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva Hymnography .....	35
Later Developments .....	35
Nonprescriptive Evidence .....	40
Hinduism and Judaism .....	43
Indo-Judaic Studies and the Jews of India .....	43
The Comparative Study of Hinduism and Judaism .....	45
Hindu-Jewish Dialogues .....	46
Secularism .....	
Secularism and Religion-State Relations in Modern India .....	50
Meanings of Secularism .....	50
Religion and State in the Colonial Era .....	51
Independence and the Constitution .....	53
Contemporary Practices and Problems .....	55
Secularism: A Search for Conceptual Spaces .....	57
Background Conditions .....	58
Hinduism .....	59
The Idea of Conceptual Spaces .....	60
Background Conditions of Religious Freedom in the Ancient Hindu World .....	61
Secular Elements in the Pre-nationalist World of Hindus .....	62
<i>Guru-Pir</i> Tradition .....	63

Akbar .....	64
Unorthodox Social Movements in the 19th and Early 20th Century .....	66
Ancient Ideas in New Forms: Gandhian Secularism .....	67
Political Hinduism and Political Secularism .....	68
Nāgas .....	72
Trimūrti .....	81
Historical Development .....	81
Iconographic Testimonies .....	85
Western Encounters .....	86
Conclusion .....	88
Austria .....	91
“Hindus” and the “Hindu Religious Organization Austria” .....	91
Hindu Mandir Gemeinschaft (Hindu Mandir Community), Vienna .....	92
Hindu Mandir Gesellschaft (Hindu Mandir Association), Vienna .....	92
Bochasanwasi Akshar Purushottam Sanstha .....	93
Śrī Śrī Rādhā-Govinda Mandir (Gaudiya Math Vienna) .....	93
Śrī Hari Om Sanātan Dharm Mandir .....	94
Conclusion .....	94
Germany .....	95
“Indian” Migration to Germany .....	95
Low-scale Organizations as Associations .....	95
Temples and Communities of Tamil Hindus .....	96
Afghan Hindus .....	97
Further Tokens of Plurality .....	98
Conclusion: Hindus in Public Society .....	98
Brahma Kumaris and Dada Lekhraj .....	100
Founder Dada Lekhraj and His Vision .....	100
The Early Years: Om Mandali and the Move to Mount Abu .....	102
The Teachings of the Brahma Kumaris .....	102
Membership and Practice .....	105
The Movement Today .....	106
General Index .....	109
Additional Indices .....	401
Gods, Goddesses, and Powers .....	403
Groups of Gods, Goddesses, and Powers .....	420
Religious and/or Philosophical Traditions (pre-1900) .....	423
Religious Specialists/Roles .....	427
Poets, Teachers, Saints (pre-1900) .....	431
Festivals .....	446
Performance Traditions .....	449
Primary Sources .....	451

# Table of Contents, Volumes I–VI

## Regions and Regional Traditions

Overview article .....	I: 3
East	
Assam and the Eastern States .....	I: 13
Bengal .....	I: 24
Orissa .....	I: 43
North	
Bihar .....	I: 59
Himalaya Region .....	I: 73
Jharkhand .....	I: 87
Kashmir .....	I: 99
Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh .....	I: 127
Punjab .....	I: 153
Uttar Pradesh .....	I: 171
South	
Andhra Pradesh .....	I: 187
Karnataka .....	I: 201
Kerala .....	I: 221
Tamil Nadu .....	I: 233
West	
Goa .....	I: 249
Gujarat .....	I: 255
Maharashtra .....	I: 271
Rajasthan .....	I: 285
South Asia outside of India	
Bangladesh .....	I: 301
Nepal .....	I: 307
Pakistan .....	I: 315
Sri Lanka .....	I: 321
Historical Southeast Asia	
Burma .....	I: 337
Cambodia .....	I: 345
Indonesia .....	I: 353
Thailand .....	I: 371

## Sacred Space and Time

Tīrtha and Tīrthayātrā: Salvific Space and Pilgrimage .....	I: 381
Cosmic Cycles, Cosmology, and Cosmography .....	I: 411
Festivals .....	I: 429
Processions .....	I: 445

## Gods, Goddesses, and Divine Powers

Overview article .....	I: 457
Asuras and Daityas .....	I: 469
Ayyappan .....	I: 479
Bhairava .....	I: 485
Bhūdevī .....	I: 491
Brahmā .....	I: 499

Dattātreyā .....	I: 513
Draupadī and Sitā .....	I: 517
Durgā .....	I: 535
Gaṇapati/Gaṇeśa .....	I: 551
Gandharvas and Apsarases .....	I: 565
Gaṅgā .....	I: 571
Hanumān .....	I: 579
Kālī .....	I: 587
Kṛṣṇa .....	I: 605
Kuladevī .....	I: 621
Mahādevī .....	I: 627
Murukaṇ .....	I: 637
Narmadā .....	VI: 3
Navagrahas .....	I: 647
Pārvatī .....	I: 655
Rādhā .....	I: 675
Rāma .....	I: 681
River Goddesses .....	I: 695
Rṣis .....	I: 703
Sacred Animals .....	I: 711
Santoṣi Mā .....	I: 719
Sarasvatī .....	I: 725
Śītalādevī .....	I: 733
Śiva .....	I: 741
Śrī-Lakṣmī .....	I: 755
Vedic Gods .....	I: 765
Veṅkaṭeśvara .....	I: 781
Viṣṇu .....	I: 787
Yakṣas and Yakṣiṇīs .....	I: 801
Yama .....	I: 807
Yamunā .....	I: 817
Yoginīs .....	I: 821
<b>Sacred Texts and Languages</b>	
Sanskrit Texts and Language .....	II: 3
Tamil Texts and Language .....	II: 19
Vedas and Brāhmaṇas .....	II: 27
Upaniṣads and Āraṇyakas .....	II: 41
Dharmaśāstra .....	II: 56
Mahābhārata .....	II: 72
Bhagavadgītā .....	II: 95
Rāmāyaṇa .....	II: 111
Purāṇas .....	II: 127
Śaiva Texts .....	VI: 10
Vaiṣṇava Saṃhitās .....	II: 153
Tantras .....	II: 168
Sūtras .....	II: 182
Stotras, Sanskrit Hymns .....	II: 193
Languages and Literatures of the Vernaculars: North Indian .....	II: 208
Languages and Literatures of the Vernaculars: South Indian .....	II: 225
Hagiography .....	II: 237
Oral Traditions and Folklore .....	II: 249



Āyurveda .....	II: 267
Astrology and Astronomy (Jyotiṣa) .....	II: 281
Language and Linguistics .....	II: 295
Mathematics and Geometry .....	II: 309
Vāstuśāstra .....	II: 318
<b>Ritual Traditions</b>	
Temple Rituals: North India .....	II: 327
Temple Rituals: South India .....	II: 335
Domestic Rituals .....	II: 347
Yajña .....	II: 361
Pūja and Darśana .....	II: 380
Saṃskāras .....	II: 395
Mantras .....	II: 402
Possession .....	II: 416
Vratas .....	II: 427
Purity and Impurity .....	II: 435
Ritual Food .....	II: 450
Intoxication .....	II: 459
Raṅgoli and Kōlam .....	II: 472
Death and Afterlife .....	II: 479
<b>Arts</b>	
Temple: Form and Function .....	II: 495
Drama and Theatre .....	II: 511
Iconography and Images: Ancient Concepts .....	II: 529
Iconography and Images: Art .....	II: 536
Iconography and Images: A Methodology .....	II: 550
Maṇḍalas and Yantras .....	II: 560
Music .....	II: 574
Kīrtan and Bhajan .....	II: 585
Dance: Classical Tradition .....	II: 599
Dance: Regional Tradition: Kerala .....	II: 606
Martial Arts .....	II: 615
Rasa Theory .....	II: 623
Citrakathā, Paintings, and Popular Prints .....	II: 630
Hinduism and Film: Bollywood .....	II: 636
Hinduism and Film: Tamil Cinema .....	II: 651
Hinduism and Modern Literature .....	II: 659
<b>Concepts</b>	
Adhikāra .....	II: 671
Ahiṃsā .....	II: 675
Artha .....	II: 680
Āśrama and Saṃnyāsa .....	II: 684
Ātman .....	II: 689
Auspiciousness and Inauspiciousness .....	II: 693
Avatāra .....	II: 701
Avidyā .....	II: 706
Bhakti .....	II: 710
Body .....	II: 720
Brahman .....	II: 724

Consciousness and Mind .....	II: 729
Dharma .....	II: 736
Divination .....	II: 743
Gift and Gift Giving .....	II: 747
Grace and Compassion .....	II: 752
Guṇa .....	II: 758
Īśvara .....	II: 762
Jīvanmukta .....	II: 768
Kāma .....	II: 772
Karman .....	II: 778
Liberation .....	II: 788
Līlā .....	II: 793
Madness (Unmāda) .....	II: 798
Mahābhūtas .....	II: 806
Māyā .....	II: 818
Meditation .....	II: 822
Nirguṇa and Saguṇa .....	II: 826
Prakṛti .....	II: 833
Puruṣa .....	II: 838
Śakti .....	II: 843
Saṃsāra .....	II: 848
Satya .....	II: 855
Sevā .....	II: 861
Tapas .....	II: 865
Time and Destiny .....	II: 870
Untouchability .....	II: 876
Wisdom and Knowledge (Jñāna/Vidyā) .....	II: 881
<b>Society</b>	
Ādivāsīs .....	III: 3
Akhārās: Warrior Ascetics .....	III: 11
Akhārās: Wrestlers .....	III: 18
Caste .....	III: 25
Childhood .....	III: 39
Devadāsīs/Courtesans .....	V: 715
Dalits/Ex-Untouchables .....	IV: 779
Family .....	III: 46
Female Ascetics .....	III: 60
Food .....	III: 68
Foreigner (Mleccha) .....	III: 76
Gender .....	IV: 788
Hijrās .....	III: 82
Kingship .....	III: 90
Kinship and Marriage .....	III: 97
Monasteries .....	III: 116
Old Age .....	III: 127
Politics and Economy .....	III: 135
Religious Endowments and Gift Giving .....	III: 151
Sampradāya .....	III: 156
Satī and Widowhood: Satī .....	III: 165
Satī and Widowhood: Widowhood .....	III: 173
Town and City .....	III: 177
Trade and Merchants .....	III: 186

Transmission of Knowledge .....	III: 194
Travel Regulations .....	III: 203
Village .....	III: 208
<b>Religious Specialists</b>	
Astrologers .....	III: 217
Bards and Reciters .....	III: 222
Gurus and Ācāryas .....	III: 227
Healers .....	III: 235
Jādūgars .....	IV: 806
Paṇḍās .....	III: 240
Paṇḍits .....	III: 245
Priests .....	III: 252
Sādhus, Saṃnyāsīs, and Yogīs .....	III: 262
<b>Religious Traditions</b>	
Aghoris .....	III: 281
Bāuls .....	III: 285
Bhāgavatas .....	III: 295
Daśanāmīs .....	III: 302
Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism .....	III: 312
Haridāśī Saṃpradāya .....	III: 329
Kabīrpanthis .....	III: 339
Kānphaṭās .....	III: 347
Kāpālikas .....	III: 355
Kashmir Śaivism .....	III: 362
Liṅgāyats .....	III: 378
Mādhva Saṃpradāya .....	III: 393
Mahānubhāvs .....	III: 402
Nāth Saṃpradāya .....	III: 409
Nimbārka Saṃpradāya .....	III: 429
Pāñcarātra .....	III: 444
Pāśupatas .....	III: 458
Rādhāvallabha Saṃpradāya .....	III: 467
Rāmānandīs .....	III: 478
Rasāyana .....	III: 489
Ravidāsīs .....	III: 500
Sahajiyās .....	III: 507
Śaiva Siddhānta .....	III: 514
Sants .....	III: 532
Smārta .....	III: 546
Śrīvaiṣṇavism .....	III: 556
Śrīvidyā .....	IV: 815
Tantra .....	III: 574
Vaikhānasa .....	III: 589
Vallabha Saṃpradāya .....	III: 606
Vārkarī Saṃpradāy .....	III: 617
<b>Philosophy</b>	
Ājīvika .....	IV: 823
Lokāyata .....	III: 629
Mīmāṃsā .....	III: 643

Nyāya and Navyanyāya .....	III: 657
Philosophy of Language .....	III: 672
Sāṃkhya .....	III: 685
Vaiśeṣika .....	III: 699
Vedānta: Advaita Vedānta and the Schools of Vedānta .....	III: 719
Vedānta: Modern Vedānta .....	III: 735
Yoga: Pātañjala Yoga .....	III: 745
Yoga: Rāja Yoga .....	III: 760
Yoga: Haṭha Yoga .....	III: 770
Yoga: Modern Yoga .....	III: 782
<b>Historical Perspectives</b>	
Indus Civilization (–1750 BCE) .....	IV: 3
Vedic Period (1750–400 BCE) .....	IV: 19
Historical Perspectives: Between 400 BCE and 600 CE .....	IV: 29
Hindu Medieval Regional Kingdoms (600–1526 CE) .....	IV: 51
Vijayanagara (1336–1646) .....	IV: 73
Mughal Empire (1526–1759) .....	IV: 81
Maratha (1674–1818) .....	IV: 96
British Rule (1757–1947) .....	IV: 103
Independent India (1947–) .....	IV: 121
<b>Poets, Teachers and Saints</b>	
Abhinavagupta .....	IV: 139
Akkamahādēvi .....	IV: 150
Ālvārs .....	IV: 157
Avvaiyār .....	IV: 172
Basava .....	IV: 177
Bharṭṛhari .....	IV: 185
Caitanya .....	IV: 193
Cokhāmeḷā .....	IV: 201
Dādū Dayāl .....	IV: 209
Eknāth .....	IV: 218
Gārgī .....	IV: 227
Hit Harivaṃś .....	IV: 234
Jayadeva .....	IV: 241
Jīva Gosvāmī .....	IV: 249
Jñāndev .....	IV: 258
Kabīr .....	IV: 265
Lallā .....	IV: 272
Madhva .....	IV: 280
Mīrābāī .....	IV: 288
Nāmdēv .....	IV: 296
Narasimha Mehtā .....	IV: 303
Nāyaṇārs .....	IV: 310
Rāmānanda .....	IV: 335
Rāmānuja .....	IV: 344
Rāmdās .....	IV: 358
Rāmprasād Sen .....	IV: 365
Ravidās .....	IV: 371
Rūpa Gosvāmī .....	IV: 379
Śaṅkara .....	IV: 388

Śaṅkaradeva and Mādhavadeva .....	IV: 397
Sūrdās .....	IV: 405
Tarigoṇḍa Veṅgamāmba .....	IV: 413
Tukārām .....	IV: 420
Tulsīdās .....	IV: 429
Tyāgarājā .....	IV: 438
Vallabha .....	IV: 448
Vedāntadeśika .....	IV: 462
Yāmunācārya .....	IV: 470
<b>Relation to Other Religions and Traditions</b>	
Hinduism and Buddhism: Ancient Period .....	IV: 479
Hinduism and Buddhism: Modern Period .....	IV: 494
Hinduism and Christianity .....	IV: 505
Hinduism and Dravidian Identity .....	V: 725
Hinduism and Islam: Medieval and Premodern Period .....	IV: 521
Hinduism and Islam: Modern Period North India .....	IV: 530
Hinduism and Islam: Modern Period South India .....	IV: 546
Hinduism and Jainism .....	IV: 559
Hinduism and Judaism .....	VI: 43
Hinduism and Sikhism .....	IV: 573
Hinduism and Tribal Religions in India .....	IV: 588
Hinduism and Zoroastrianism .....	IV: 605
<b>Hinduism and Contemporary Issues</b>	
Animal Rights .....	IV: 619
Atheism and Rationalism .....	IV: 626
Bioethics .....	IV: 633
Commodification .....	IV: 641
Dalit Critiques of Hinduism .....	IV: 650
Ecology .....	IV: 663
Ethics .....	IV: 677
Feminism .....	V: 734
Human Rights .....	IV: 692
Internet .....	IV: 700
Modern Legal Framework .....	IV: 707
Nationalism .....	V: 750
New Age Spirituality .....	IV: 718
Politics and Media .....	V: 760
Science .....	IV: 726
Secularism: Secularism and Religion-State Relations in Modern India .....	VI: 50
Secularism: A Search for Conceptual Spaces: .....	VI: 57
Sexuality .....	IV: 740
Tolerance and Responses to Religious Pluralism .....	IV: 754
Tourism .....	IV: 768
<b>Religious Symbols</b>	
Cakra .....	V: 3
Colors .....	V: 7
Conch .....	V: 14
Divine Attributes and Emblems .....	V: 16
Divine Musical Instruments .....	V: 36

Dress and Adornment .....	V: 45
Fire .....	V: 50
Gemstones .....	V: 59
Hair .....	V: 65
Liṅga .....	V: 72
Lotus .....	V: 82
Mālā .....	V: 87
Mūdrās .....	V: 91
Nāgas .....	VI: 72
Om̐ .....	V: 100
Prasāda .....	V: 103
Rām .....	V: 112
Sacred Threads .....	V: 119
Śalagrāma .....	V: 123
Smell .....	V: 127
Sound .....	V: 134
Svastika .....	V: 150
Tilaka and Other Forehead Marks .....	V: 152
Trees and Plants .....	V: 161
Trimūrti .....	VI: 81
Vāhanas .....	V: 168
Vibhūti .....	V: 181
Yoni .....	V: 184
 <b>Hinduism and Migration: Contemporary Communities outside South Asia</b>	
Afghanistan .....	V: 189
Australia and New Zealand .....	V: 193
Austria .....	VI: 91
Canada .....	V: 206
China .....	V: 212
Denmark .....	V: 217
East Africa .....	V: 222
Fiji .....	V: 229
France .....	V: 235
Germany .....	VI: 95
Gulf Countries .....	V: 240
Guyana .....	V: 246
Indonesia .....	V: 252
Italy .....	V: 257
Malaysia .....	V: 263
Mauritius .....	V: 269
Netherlands .....	V: 274
Norway .....	V: 279
Portugal .....	V: 285
Russia .....	V: 291
Singapore .....	V: 295
South Africa .....	V: 300
Suriname .....	V: 307
Sweden .....	V: 312
Switzerland .....	V: 317
Thailand .....	V: 324
Trinidad and Tobago .....	V: 329
United Kingdom .....	V: 334

United States .....	V: 342
Vietnam .....	V: 353
<b>Some Modern Religious Groups and Teachers</b>	
Ad Dharm .....	V: 359
Anandamayi Ma .....	V: 366
Aramuga Navalar .....	V: 373
Art of Living Movement .....	V: 380
Arya Samaj .....	V: 389
Aurobindo .....	V: 397
Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh/Osho .....	V: 405
Bhaktisiddhanta Saraswati .....	V: 415
Bharat Sevashram Sangha and Swami Pranavanandaji Maharaj .....	V: 424
Bochasanwasi Shri Akshar Purushottam Swaminarayan Sanstha .....	V: 432
Brahma Kumaris and Dada Lekhraj .....	VI: 100
Brahmo Samaj and Keshub Chandra Sen .....	V: 437
Chinmayananda and Chinmaya Mission .....	V: 445
Dayananda Saraswati .....	V: 453
Female Gurus and Ascetics .....	V: 461
Hans Ji Maharaj and the Divya Sandesh Parishad .....	V: 470
Hariharananda Aranya .....	V: 476
ISKCON and Bhaktivedanta Prabhupada .....	V: 485
Jiddu Krishnamurti .....	V: 491
Krishnamacharya .....	V: 498
Laksman Joo .....	V: 502
Maharishi Mahesh Yogi and Transcendental Meditation .....	V: 508
Mahima Dharma and Bhima Bhoi .....	V: 515
Mata Amritanandamayi Mission Trust .....	V: 523
Melmaruvattur Movement .....	V: 531
Modern Astrologers .....	V: 535
Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi .....	V: 542
Muktananda and Siddha Yoga .....	V: 552
Narayana Guru .....	V: 559
Radhakrishnan .....	V: 566
Radhasoamis .....	V: 572
Ramakrishna .....	V: 578
Ramakrishna Math and Mission .....	V: 586
Ramana Maharshi .....	V: 594
Rammohun Roy .....	V: 602
Sarada Devi .....	V: 610
Satguru Sivaya Subrahmuniaswami .....	V: 619
Sathya Sai Baba .....	V: 625
Satnamis .....	V: 634
Shirdi Sai Baba .....	V: 641
Sivananda and the Divine Light Society .....	V: 651
Swadhyaya Movement and Pandurang Shastri Athavale .....	V: 659
Swaminarayan and Swaminarayan Hinduism .....	V: 664
Tagore .....	V: 672
Theosophical Society .....	V: 679
Vivekananda .....	V: 689
Vivekananda Kendra .....	V: 698
Yogananda and the Self-Realization Fellowship .....	V: 704

# Śaiva Texts

Those engaged in the study of Śaivism have before them in manuscript collections in the Indian subcontinent and around the world a great abundance and variety of textual sources, providing a rich record of what Śaivas of various persuasions were instructed to do and think as adherents of their religion, beginning from the period between the Maurya and Gupta empires and then increasing to a flood from the 5th century CE onwards, when Śaivism emerges into view as the dominant faith of the Indian subcontinent and large parts of Southeast Asia. During the last four decades our knowledge of this literature and its connections with the related textual traditions of tantric Buddhism, Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism (→ Pāñcarātra), and the Jaina Mantraśāstra, has increased greatly through the study of the contents of these collections by a growing number of scholars. The progress of this research has been accelerated by two major undertakings. The first is the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (1970–2002) and its continuation, the Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (2002–), which, as a result of an agreement between the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Council) and the Government of Nepal, has microfilmed and made readily accessible to scholars about 140,000 Nepalese and East Indian manuscripts preserved in the relative isolation and mild climate of the Kathmandu valley, dating in the case of Śaiva manuscripts from the 9th century onwards. The second is the collection amassed from the 1950s onwards by the Institut Français de Pondichéry (French Institute of Pondicherry) of 8600 predominantly Śaiva South Indian palm-leaf manuscripts and 1144 Devanagari paper transcripts, of which the latter, containing approximately two thousand texts, have in recent years been scanned and made available on the Internet, with images of the former to follow. There are many other important collections with substantial holdings of Śaiva manuscripts in India and in Europe. But the task of mapping the literature in those collections has been facilitated by the fact that these two major projects have enabled scholars to acquaint themselves with some rapidity with large quantities of previously unknown texts, or texts known only through citations, and so to identify and classify more readily than might otherwise have been

feasible the riches preserved in these other libraries. The work is far from complete, but I offer here as one who has been engaged in this research throughout this period my present understanding of what the Śaiva literature preserved in these various collections contains. I shall be comprehensive, in the sense that I shall cover the literatures of all the major branches of the Śaiva tradition of which I am aware; but I cannot attempt to be exhaustive by mentioning every work that I have seen in all of these. For in the case of many of these branches, especially those that developed or continued to develop from the 12th century down to the recent past, it is feasible to mention in a survey of this compass only the major among the works that have reached us and, among minor and ancillary texts, such as anonymous ritual handbooks and devotional hymns, only some examples. For the same reason I have excluded from consideration surviving Śaiva textual materials that were produced outside the subcontinent, on the islands of Java and Bali, and also the numerous Indian and Southeast Asian belletristic works whose narratives are taken from Śaiva mythology. My primary aim is to provide scholars with a chronologically ordered map of the main divisions of the literature and their interlocking religious contexts as they appear to me at present, reporting the regions in which texts were composed where evidence is available.

## Lay Śaivism

First there are texts followed by traditions of lay devotion to → Śiva. They include in the Śaiva perspective all instruction for the propitiation of the vedic deity Rudra found in the → Vedas and their ancillary corpora. But the principal sources in this domain are the texts of what may be called the Śivadharma corpus after the work that is probably the earliest and precedes the others in manuscripts that contain all or most of them. These are the *Śivadharma*, *Śivadharmottara*, *Śivadharmasaṃgraha*, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, *Uttarottaramahāsaṃvāda*, *Śivopaniṣad*, *Vṛṣasārasaṃgraha*, *Dharmaputrikā*, and *Lalitavistara*. They advocate the veneration of Śiva and the dedication of a third of one's wealth to the



support of his followers, the creation and maintenance of temples and other Śaiva institutions, and donations thereto, promising the devotee success and security in this life and, after death, the finite reward of ascension to the deity's paradise (Śivaloka, Rudraloka), followed, once the merit that earned that reward has been exhausted, by the most desirable of incarnations in the human world. They claim, moreover, that the rewards of adherence extend in various degrees to the devotee's patriline and dependents.

Also in this lay Śaiva domain are certain → Purāṇas, notably the *Skandapurāṇa*, *Vāyupurāṇa*, *Liṅgapurāṇa*, *Devīpurāṇa*, and *Śivapurāṇa*, and a great number of short compositions promoting Śaiva sacred sites (*śivakṣetra*, *śivāyatana*) that have been given the status of scripture by attribution to one of these, most commonly the *Skandapurāṇa*, often in large collections covering the sites of whole regions. Thus we have, for example, a *Himavatkhanda*, a *Revākhanda*, an *Avantikhaṇḍa*, a *Sahyādrīkhanda*, a *Prabhāsakhaṇḍa*, a *Nāgarakhanda*, a *Kāśīkhanda*, and a *Paunḍrakhaṇḍa* assigned to the *Skandapurāṇa*. But perhaps even greater is the number of those that circulated locally and were never redacted into larger wholes, their claim to scriptural status being sustained by no more than an assertion in their colophons that they are parts of some Purāṇa. Examples are the *Nepālamāhātmya* attributed to a *Himavatkhanda* of the *Skandapurāṇa*, the *Pampāmāhātmya* attributed to a *Hemakūṭakhaṇḍa* of the same, the *Āmardakamāhātmya* attributed to a *Kāverīkhanda* of the *Padmapurāṇa*, and the *Ekaliṅgamāhātmya* attributed to the *Vāyupurāṇa*. In some cases the loci of attribution appear to have had no independent existence. Thus in → Kashmir it was conventional to attribute such compositions to the *Bhṛṅgīśasamhitā* or *Ādipurāṇa*, though no manuscripts of works bearing these names have come to light, let alone manuscripts of them containing these supposed parts.

Since this literature is composed for the laity, it is generally written in undemanding Sanskrit that could be expected to be readily understood by a larger public, but there is also much writing of this kind that recognizes the limitation in this regard of even this simple form of the learned lingua franca by adopting Tamil, Telugu, and other vernacular languages. As for the Śivadharm corpus, the same limitation prompts the *Śivadharmottara* to recommend that it be taught to its audiences in

the languages of their regions. The text probably envisages its being chanted in Sanskrit with each verse or group of verses followed by an explanation in the vernacular. But it could also be taken as advocating the production of translations. One survives: the Tamil *Civatarumōttaram* authored by Vedajñāna I in the 16th century.

## Initiatory Śaivism

Then there are the literatures of forms of Śaivism for initiates, which set themselves far above that for the laity by offering the individual alone the attainment of the non-finite goal of → liberation (*mokṣa*). This initiatory Śaivism comprises (1) the systems of the Atimārga, namely those of the Pāñcārthika → Pāśupatas (Atimārga I), the Lākulas, also known as Kālamukhas (Atimārga II), and the → Kāpālikas, also known as Mahāvratins or adherents of the Somasiddhānta (Atimārga III), which arose in that order, (2) those of the Mantramārga or “tantric Śaivism” that developed on the basis of the second and third, coexisted with all three, and promised not only liberation but also, for those initiates consecrated to office, the ability to accomplish supernatural effects (*siddhi*) such as the averting or counteracting of calamities (*śānti*) and the warding off or destruction of enemies (*abhicāra*), and (3) those of the predominantly Śākta Kulamārga, which offered the same goals as the Mantramārga, but propagated distinct “Kaula” methods that have more in common with the practices of Atimārga III than with those of the Mantramārga and indeed, I propose, developed directly from that source, preserving most of its distinctive features.

## Chronology

The dating of these traditions cannot be determined with any precision from the available data; but we may say that the Atimārga came into existence probably no later than the 2nd century CE and reached its third stage not later than the 5th, the earliest dateable reference to the Kāpālikas of Atimārga III being found in Agastyaśiṃha's 5th-century commentary on the Jaina *Dasaveyāliyasutta*, supposed earlier references being based on misconceptions concerning the date of the sources in question. The Mantramārga

and Kulamārga emerged thereafter, the earliest text of the former, the *Niśvāsamūla*, assignable to the period 450–550 CE, presupposing Atimārga II, whose cosmic hierarchy it has inherited and extended.

Mantramārgic learned exposition on the basis of an already constituted corpus of scriptural texts is in evidence not later than the 8th century and was at its height in both the Mantramārga and the Kulamārga from the 9th to the 12th. The earliest unambiguous dateable evidence of the Kulamārga is in the early 9th century, in the *Haravijaya* of the Kashmirian Ratnākara. There may be a reference to followers of the Kulamārga in the description of the temple of the goddess Vindhyavāsini in the Prakrit Kāvya *Gauḍavaho* of Vākpatirāja, written in the first half of the 8th century; but this is not beyond doubt, the reference there to what may be “Kaula women,” that is to say, to female initiates in the Kulamārga or to the wives of male initiates, being more probably to women of the Kol tribe that lived in the region in which that temple is located.

The literature of lay devotion began when the Atimārga was already established and continued to grow after the emergence of the Mantramārga. It might be assumed that it was produced by adherents of the initiatory traditions for the guidance of their uninitiated followers. However, while these texts show some awareness of the initiatory traditions, either of the Atimārga alone or of both that and the Mantramārga, and while the initiatory traditions promoted this literature as valid prescription for their lay followers, divergences in matters of doctrine argue against the assumption that they themselves produced it. It is rather the product of an old and widespread tradition that the initiatory systems acknowledged when they rose to prominence, just as they took over preexisting Śaiva temple cults.

## The Atimārga

The corpus of texts known to us from the Atimārga is small. From the Pāñcārthika Pāsupatas (Atimārga I) we have their foundational text, the *Pāñcārtha* or *Pāsupatasūtra*, probably much the earliest of our texts of initiatory Śaivism, perhaps of the 2nd century CE, containing practical religious instruction and the *mantras* of this system, with the commentary (*Pāñcārthabhāṣya*) of Kaunḍinya. The latter, poorly transmitted in three

manuscripts of which only one is complete, was probably composed at some time between 400 and 550 CE. We also have five short verse texts. Of these the *Samśkāraavidhi*, the *Pātravidhi*, the *Prāyaścittavidhi*, and the *Anteṣṭividhi*, which have come down to us in a single manuscript, are devoted as their titles reveal to the procedure of the initiation ceremony, rules concerning the ascetic’s begging bowl, penances, and the procedures for the disposal of the dead, principally burial. The fifth, the *Gaṇakārikā*, arranges the various key elements of the teaching pertaining to initiation and the stages of the post-initiatory discipline contained in the *Pāñcārthabhāṣya* under nine sets (*gaṇas*) of items, comprising eight pentads and one triad. This too, together with a commentary, the *Ratnaṭikā*, has reached us through a single manuscript, which was preserved by good fortune in a bundle of Jaina texts in a Jaina library in Patan (Pāṭan).

I consider it probable that these five texts, like the *Pāñcārtha*, were taught as revelation rather than as works of human scholarship. For the Sanskrit of the *Gaṇakārikā* and the four *vidhi* texts does not conform throughout to the norms expected of writing claimed by authors as their own. Rather its transgressions of the rules of the grammarians associate it with the register of Sanskrit seen in the surviving early Śaiva scriptures of the Mantramārga. In support of the position that the *Gaṇakārikā* was considered to be scripture rather than mere human exegesis we may also cite the fact that the author of the commentary on the text presents it as the answer given to a question of a disciple that begins with the words “Is it the case, O Bhagavat...?”. For this is how Kaunḍinya introduces the *Pāñcārtha* in his *Pāñcārthabhāṣya*, as the answer given by Śiva as the first teacher (named Lakuliśa in later sources) to a question by Kuśika, his first disciple, which begins with the words “O Bhagavat, is there or is there not a definitive removing of all these forms of suffering?”. This strongly suggests that the author of the *Ratnaṭikā* considered the propagation of the *Gaṇakārikā* to be on a par with that of the *Pāñcārtha*. Furthermore, the *Prāyaścittavidhi* is said in its first colophon to have been “taught by the Venerable Gārgya”. This attribution may be to the Gārgya who was the second of the four disciples of Lakuliśa held to have been the progenitors of the four Pāñcārthika lineages (*gotra*). This is consistent with a belief that the text is revelation, since a tradition seen in the earliest *Skandapurāṇa*

holds that these four were created from the four faces of Śiva and instructed to take birth in the world for the salvation of Brahmans. It is further supported by the colophon's expression "taught by" (*-upadiṣṭa*) as opposed to "composed by" (*-viracita*) or the like.

Four other small Pāñcārthika works are contained in the bundle of Jaina manuscripts that contains the *Gaṇakārikā* and its commentary. The first comprises 21 verses on the universal ethical principles (*yamas*) of the Pāñcārthikas following the *Pañcārthabhāṣya*, and the second, in 13 verses, follows obeisance to the 28 incarnations of Rudra, from Śveta to Lakulīṣa, with a prayer to the last that the author may master his doctrine. Both inform us that they are the work of an otherwise unknown ascetic called Viśuddhamuni. The third, in 26 āryā verses, summarizes, without indication of authorship, what Kauṇḍinya teaches in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* on the nature of Śiva/Rudra as the cause (*kāraṇa*) of all things, the first of the five topics (*padārtha*, *artha*) that give the foundational text its name (*Pañcārtha*) and thereby its followers theirs (Pāñcārthika). This is only the first part of a work that summarized the teaching of the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* on all five topics, namely *kāraṇa* (cause), *kārya* (effect), *vidhi* (observance), *yoga* (union), and *duḥkhānta* (the end of suffering). The fourth is a hymn of seven verses in which Rudra is invoked under 21 names followed by instruction to the reader that the recitation of these names or even one of them at the end of his worship will lead him to Śiva when he dies and the information that this teaching was given by Rudra in the *Skandapurāṇa* at the request of Gaurī, followed by a verse of obeisance to the goddess as the *pañcārthavidyā* (gnosis of the *Pañcārtha*).

Apart from these sources we have in the Mantramārga's *Niśvāsamukha* a brief versified account of Atimārga I based on the instructional parts of the *Pañcārtha* with the addition of a rule that one should offer Śiva only flowers that have withered and fallen to the ground, and another in a puranic work from Karnataka, the *Pampāmāhātmya*, which incorporates a modified version of the eight verses of the *Gaṇakārikā* and elaborates the discipline following our known sources, but also provides revealing information not found in those, notably that when in the last stage of the Pāñcārthika's ascetic discipline he retires to die in a cremation ground, it is envisaged that he will do so by ending his life through  $\rightarrow$  *yoga*, by extracting his soul from his body

through  $\rightarrow$  meditation, a practice only alluded to in the *Pañcārtha* and its commentary but much stressed in the Mantramārga, particularly in the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, which in its prescriptions for ascetic initiates perpetuates the discipline of the Atimārga.

Pāñcārthika tradition is also reflected in a number of puranic works. These are of uncertain value as evidence of properly Pāñcārthika beliefs and practices, representing rather modifications through accommodation to Brahmanical orthopraxy. But the *Pampāmāhātmya* is exceptional in this regard, as is the earliest, and probably original *Skandapurāṇa*, a work whose first redaction, in North India, was probably produced within the period 550–650 CE, and which reaches us in manuscripts of which the earliest was penned in 810/811 CE. For this contains valuable traditions concerning the early history of this form of Śaivism, its lineages, and sacred sites.

As for the scriptures of Atimārga II, we have, apart from their titles, only a few verses quoted from one of them, the *Pañcārthapramāṇa*, in a mantramargic commentary. Knowledge of the textual prescriptions of this tradition can be gained at present only from the account of it given in the Mantramārga's *Niśvāsamukha* and from scattered remarks in other sources. We also have an account in the *Pampāmāhātmya*; but this, being secondary, is of uncertain reliability in the absence of more detailed primary sources.

The situation with the Kāpālīka/Mahāvratin tradition of Atimārga III, also known as the Somasiddhānta, is much the same, though it is now clear that much of its practice was carried forward into the more antinomian traditions of the Mantramārga and Kulamārga and that with it may have come textual material of which some, such as the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* incorporated in the *Jayadrathayāmala*, may have undergone little redactional modification. Here too we have a secondary source of uncertain value in the *Pampāmāhātmya*.

In the prescriptive evidence of the Atimārga the emphasis is on meditative absorption in the deity and countercultural asceticism ( $\rightarrow$  *tapas*), that is to say, on practices that draw their strength and appeal from their contravention of the norms of conduct imposed by the dominant, Brahmanical culture. Nonetheless this is transcendence from within. For initiation and thence the practice of the discipline are stated in our sources to be accessible only to Brahmans and only to those who have duly

passed through the ceremony that qualifies a boy to begin the study of the Veda. This requirement excludes women, though we have epigraphic evidence in an inscription of 1208/1209 from Mount Abu that this exclusion was not always enforced.

## The Mantramārga

In the texts of the Mantramārga access is extended to Śiva devotees in all the four caste-classes (*varṇa*), and also to women, though in the last case usually only as passive beneficiaries of initiation rather than as active initiates with access to office. By “passive beneficiary” I mean those who have received the form of initiation termed “without seed” (*nirbījā dīkṣā*), in which the destruction of the soul’s bonds effected by the ritual is made to include that of the post-initiatory discipline (*samayapāśa*). Such persons are promised the benefit of initiation, namely liberation at death, but freed of the inconvenience of the ritual obligations that bind ordinary initiates. They are passive beneficiaries, then, in the sense that they do not have to do what ordinary initiates do. They are expected instead to maintain the duties they had as lay Śaivas before their initiation. Moreover, although meditation and asceticism are carried over into these texts it is the prescription of ritual that now dominates; and this comprises not only ritual worship as the regular duty of initiates but also, and more crucially, the ritual of initiation itself (*dīkṣā*), which, greatly elaborated, is promoted as the means by which Śiva himself chooses to destroy the bonds of souls ripe for liberation, acting through the person of his consecrated officiants (*ācārya*, → *guru*), who alone are empowered to perform the ritual. This shift justifies the giving of initiation to devotees such as women, and also to rulers, who by reason of their duties of governance are not able thereafter to take on any additional ritual commitments. Only for others was initiation promoted as both liberating and qualificatory. The substantial rewards bestowed on officiants for performing such initiations for kings was no doubt among the principal drivers of the growth and spread of the Mantramārga’s institutions. In addition the literature sets out rituals for the installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) of → *lingas*, other substrates of worship, and the temples that enshrine them, and for the accomplishment of the supernatural effects mentioned above.

## The Saiddhāntika Scriptures

The Mantramārga comprises two main divisions. The first of these came to call itself the Siddhānta (“The Definitive Doctrine”; see → Śaiva Siddhānta). Its texts dominate the prescription of the more visible domains of the Mantramārga, presenting its officiants as performing the consecration of *lingas* and temples where worship was to be performed for the collective benefit of all, holding office as the superintendents of the monasteries (*maṭha*) commonly attached to them, and taking the office of the king’s preceptor (*rājaguru*), offering the monarch the benefit of Śaiva initiation and consecrating him in his office in a Śaiva variant of the Brahmanical ceremony of royal consecration (*rājyābhiṣeka*), thus promoting its officiants as vital to the welfare of the whole society.

Of its early scriptures those that survive completely or substantially are the *Niśvāsa* corpus (*Niśvāsamukha*, *Niśvāsamūla*, *Niśvāsanaya*, *Niśvāsottara*, *Niśvāsaḡuhya*, and *Niśvāsakārikā*, the last including the *Dīkṣottara*), various texts that are or claim to be redactions of the *Kālottara* (*Jñānapañcāśikā*, *Śatika*, *Sārdhaśatika*, *Dviśatika*, *Sārdhatrīśatika*, *Saptaśatika*, *Trayodaśaśatika*, and *Brhatkālottara*), the *Sarvajñānottara*, the *Pārameśvara* (*Pauṣkarapārameśvara*), the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, the *Mataṅga-pārameśvara*, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Mṛgendra*, and the *Parākhyā*. These scriptural sources are supplemented by two digests, the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hṛdayaśiva and the *Nityādisaṃgraha* of Takṣakavarta, which preserve for us passages of several scriptures of the Mantramārga that have not otherwise reached us, both Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika.

## The Saiddhāntika Exegesis

We also have a body of learned exegesis on some of these works. On the doctrinal chapters of the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* we have a running prose commentary, the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti*, by Sadyojyotis, also known as Kheṭabāla or Kheṭanandana, and on those of the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* we have the following parts of a commentary (*Rauravavṛtti*) in verse by the same author, transmitted to us as independent treatises: the *Bhogakārikā*, the *Mokṣakārikā*, and the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā*. We also have



his *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* and *Tattvasaṃgraha*, in which he sets out Saiddhāntika ontology following, according to a later authority, the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* and *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* respectively, and the *Nareśvaraparikṣā*, a systematic philosophical treatise in which he formulates his understanding of the Siddhānta's doctrines of the soul and god without explicit dependence on any individual scripture. A near contemporary, Br̥haspati, wrote a *Rauravavārttika*, a commentary in verse on the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, and the *Śivatānu*, a verse treatise of unknown scriptural affiliation. But of these two works we now have only citations in the works of others. We have no evidence of where either of these early commentators was active. As for their date, both lived before the 9th century, probably within the period 675–750 CE.

From the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha we have an exhaustive commentary on the *Mṛgendra*. We know that he also wrote a subcommentary (*-tippanaka*) on Sadyojyotis' *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* and a long commentary (*br̥haṭṭikā*) called the *Śaranniśā* on the same author's *Tattvasaṃgraha*; but as yet no manuscript of either has been located.

From his son Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha we have elaborate prose commentaries on the doctrinal chapters of the *Kiraṇa* and on the *Sārdhatriśatika* recension of the *Kālottara* and the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, these covering the whole of those Tantras and therefore not only doctrine (*jñāna*) but also ritual (*kriyā*), meditation (*yoga*), and ascetic discipline (*caryā*). We also have his prose commentaries on four of the works of Sadyojyotis: the *Mokṣakārikā*, the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā*, the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya*, and the *Nareśvaraparikṣā*. The last of these, the *Nareśvaraparikṣāprakāśa*, is a work of rigorous philosophical argument in which Rāmakaṇṭha attempts to establish Sadyojyotis' Siddhānta against the positions of the Buddhists and others. He also composed a commentary on the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* (*Svāyambhuvoddyota*), but no manuscript of this has surfaced. These two Kashmirian authors, father and son, were active in Kashmir and neighbouring Darvabhisara (Dārvābhicāra) during the second half of the 10th century.

Two other Saiddhāntika treatises in verse have been transmitted from the period up to the 12th century: the *Ratnatrayaparikṣā* of Śrikaṇṭha and the *Tattvaparakāśa* of King Bhojadeva. Śrikaṇṭha has been assumed to be a Kashmirian and to have

been a predecessor in the teaching lineage that produced Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. But there is no evidence that supports or refutes either claim. If the King Bhojadeva to whom the *Tattvaparakāśa* is attributed is, as seems probable, the Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva to whom an important Saiddhāntika Pad-dhati, the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, is attributed, then this work is a product of Malwa (Mālava) and of the first half of the 11th century.

From Aghoraśiva, a South Indian scholar active in Chidambaram around the mid-12th century, who perpetuated the exegetical tradition of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha and Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, we have the *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā*, his subcommentary on Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's commentary on the *Mṛgendra*, commentaries on the *Dviśatika* recension of the *Kālottara*, the doctrinal chapters of the *Sarvajñānottara*, the *Bhogakārikā* and *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* of Sadyojyotis, the *Ratnatrayaparikṣā* of Śrikaṇṭha, the *Tattvaparakāśa* of Bhojadeva – this provides the only firm limit for the date of the last two works – and the *Nādakārikā* of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, 25 verses extracted from the latter's commentary on 1.5ab of the *Sārdhatriśatika* recension of the *Kālottara*.

We also have in a single South Indian manuscript a commentary called *Bālabodhinī* on some chapters of the doctrinal section (*Jñānakāṇḍa*) of the *Kiraṇa* by an author who is identified in the colophon of the first chapter as Aghoraśiva, in those of the rest as Vyākhyānikācārya, and in the closing verses before the last as Siṃharāja, son of Kāmarūpeśa and pupil of Nīlakaṇṭha, the pupil of a pupil of a *guru* at Āmardakapura (i.e. Aundah [Aumḍhā] in the Marathawada [Marāṭhavāḍā] region of Maharashtra). It is followed without any indication that a new work commences by a commentary on the *Kiraṇa*'s section on ritual (*Kriyākāṇḍa*) – only the first nine *paṭalas* (13–21) survive in our manuscript – which four of the chapter colophons call the *Cintāmaṇīṭikā* and two attribute to Aghoraśiva. On stylistic grounds it is improbable that the two commentaries are by one individual with the common Saiddhāntika initiation name Aghoraśiva and very improbable that either author is the Aghoraśiva of Chidambaram whose works have been mentioned above.

We have another commentary on the *Kiraṇa* by a certain Tryambakaśambhu about whom the text contains no further information. It draws on Kṣemarāja's commentary on the *Svacchanda*,

which places it after circa 1000 CE, and the *Vimalāvātī* of Vimalaśiva, which places it after 1101/1102.

We may wonder what proportion of the Saiddhāntika commentaries that once existed has reached us. That is impossible to determine for the earliest period, but we are able to know which scriptures could be studied with commentaries by South Indian Saiddhāntikas in the 12th century from a review of all the sources of knowledge of the Siddhānta available at that time given by Aghoraśiva's pupil Vaktraśambhu. Distinguishing between those scriptures that have received commentaries and those that have not, he gives a closed list of the first. They are the *Raurava* (*sūtrasaṃgraha*), the *Svāyambhuva* (*sūtrasaṃgraha*), the *Mrgendra*, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Parākhyā*, the *Mataṅga* (*pārameśvara*), the *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva*, the *Dviśatika*, *Sārdha-triśatika*, and *Catuḥśatika* (recensions of the *Kālottara*), the *Sarvajñānottara*, and the *Mohaśūrottara*. Of these we lack the commentaries on the *Parākhyā*, *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva*, *Catuḥśatika*, and *Mohaśūrottara*. In the case of the *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva* and *Catuḥśatika* we lack manuscripts of the scriptures themselves. The *Mohaśūrottara* does survive and will be mentioned under another heading.

From early South Indian authors we also have an independent summary of the Saiddhāntika system in the *Siddhāntadīpikā*, composed in 1071/1072 by Rāmanātha, abbot of the eastern *maṭha* at Thiruvārur (Tiruvārūr); and in the *Siddhāntasamuccaya* and *Siddhāntarahasyasāra* of Trilocanaśiva we have a presentation of the ontology and soteriology of the Siddhānta built around a digest-like compendium of citations from the Saiddhāntika scriptures and the works of Sadyojyotis. The author, who is described in its colophonic verse as the abbot of a *maṭha* in Śvetāraṇya (i.e. Thiruvēnkadu), may not be the Trilocana whose works will be mentioned below. But we can be confident that he is a relatively early author, since his work is closely allied with the other South Indian Saiddhāntika works of this period in the range of its scriptural sources and in its Kashmirian doctrinal stance. To these we may add two others works. The first is the *Śataratnasamgraha* of an Umāpatiśiva of Chidambaram. Though that is undoubtedly a later work than the *Siddhāntadīpikā* and *Siddhāntasamuccaya*, since the sources from which it has been compiled include two scriptures that are never mentioned by these or earlier

exegetes and are not transmitted in manuscripts north of the Deccan, namely the *Devikālottara* and the *Viśvasārottara*, it nonetheless adheres strictly, as the earlier treatises do, to the view of the Siddhānta espoused by Sadyojyotis, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, Aghoraśiva and others, as does its anonymous commentary (*Śataratnollekhanī*, *Śataratnollekha*). The second is the *Siddhāntaprakāśikā* of a certain Sarvātmaśambhu, since that too adheres to the basic dualistic and ritualistic tenets of the classical Siddhānta of the early commentators.

The later works of this exegetical literature, that is to say, all but the works of Sadyojyotis, add to our knowledge of the scriptural corpus, since they are rich in citations, drawing on more scriptural texts than have survived independently. However, their principal interest for the historian lies in the fact that they follow Sadyojyotis by adhering to a strictly ritualistic reading of the scriptures, holding that only the ritual of initiation, performed by a consecrated officiant, or rather by Śiva through such a person, can effect the liberation of the soul, this being accomplished subliminally at the time of initiation and becoming fully manifest only when the initiate is separated from his body through death. The sense of this doctrine in the broader context of the religion is that it constitutes a claim that the gift of liberation is entirely in the hands of the ritualists, extruding the gnostic and visionary tendencies that were present in the early Siddhānta and continued to flourish in the non-Saiddhāntika traditions of the Mantramārga as alternative routes to liberation, and challenging the claims of those traditions to be able to bring about liberation through ecstatic experience before death (→ *jīvanmukti*).

One may wonder with good reason at the large span of time, two hundred years at least, that separates Sadyojyotis' and Brhaspati's works from the rest of the Saiddhāntika exegetical literature that has reached us. The reason for this lacuna is not that no such literature was produced in the interim but rather that the Kashmirian exegesis of the 10th to 11th centuries was a dogmatic return to the strictly ritualistic soteriology of Sadyojyotis after a period during which alternative, more flexible readings of the scriptural corpus had been current. The success of this fundamentalist reformation appears to have ousted alternative readings to the extent that no manuscripts of the commentaries that taught them have come down to us. Indeed we would know nothing of these

readings were it not that some non-Saiddhāntika authors have referred to them.

In addition to commentaries we have a good number of surviving Paddhatis (“Guides”) produced by various Saiddhāntika pontiffs. These go beyond the somewhat discrepant and incomplete prescriptions of the scriptures to provide systematic and comprehensive accounts of the rituals, propagating a simpler and uniform system in the place of the diversity and complexity seen the scriptures by basing it on the Mantra system and deity set of one of these, the *Kālottara* in its *Dviśatika* or *Sārdhatrīśatika* recension, and supplementing their parsimonious prescriptions – as their titles declare, the first contains only 200 verses and the second only 350 – by drawing on other scriptural sources. Notable among these Paddhatis are the *Nityakriyānusamdhāna* and *Naimittikakriyānusamdhāna* of the Paddhati of Brahmaśambhu (*Brahmaśambhupaddhati*), the latter completed in 937/938 CE, the *Siddhāntasārāpaddhati* of Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva, composed in Malwa at an unrecorded date during the first half of the 11th century, the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu, abbot of the major Saiddhāntika monastery at Golagī (i.e. Gurgi) in the kingdom of the Kalacuris of Tripurī (i.e. Tewar), composed in 1048/1049, the *Naṭarājapaddhati* of Rāmanātha of the “Southern Golagī Monastery” founded at Thiruvārur, some 1,500 km to the South, by Brahmaśiva, an east Indian (*gauḍadeśīya*) missionary from the original foundation, composed in 1057/1058, the *Kriyāsamgrahapaddhati* of Vāladhārin, composed before 1090, the date of its only manuscript known to me, the *Vimalāvatī* of Vimalaśiva, *rājaguru* of the ruler of Magadha and resident in Banaras, composed in 1101/1102, the *Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśiva of Chidambaram, composed in 1157/1158, the undated *Jñānaratnāvalī* of his contemporary Jñānaśiva, originally from Chidambaram but living in Banaras when he wrote this work, the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* of the South Indian Trilocanaśiva, a disciple of both Aghoraśiva and Jñānaśiva, the undated and incompletely transmitted *Tattvaratnāvalī* of Vimalācārya, also called Paramaśrotriya Sadāśiva, whose only known manuscript, written in the Pala script, is probably of the 12th century, the *Siddhāntaśekhara* of Viśvanātha, who was active in Banaras in or close to the first half of the 13th century, and the *Siddhāntasāra* of the Keralan Īśanaśiva (the *Īśanaśivagurudevapaddhati*) of uncertain date.

Based on the *Mṛgendra* rather than the *Kālottara* we have the *Mṛgendrapaddhati* of the Aghoraśiva who wrote the *Kriyākramadyotikā* in 1157/1158. We also have the brief *Varuṇapaddhati* of Varuṇaśiva, which summarizes the topics of *dikṣā* and *pratiṣṭhā* in about two hundred verses without going into the details of procedure. Its date cannot be determined at present beyond noting that it echoes the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of 1048/1049 and is attested by no dateable author before Vedajñāna II of Chidambaram, the 16th-century author of a commentary on the text. This same Vedajñāna composed two digest-like Paddhatis of his own: the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* and the *Dikṣādarśa*, both of which have reached us intact. Also from the 16th century we have the Paddhati *Śivārcanacandrikā* of Appayya Dikṣita, written under the patronage of Cinna Bomma Reddi, the ruler of Vellore.

We have commentaries on five of these Paddhatis. On the *Mṛgendrapaddhati* we have that of the author’s pupil Vaktraśambhu. On the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu we have that of Trilocanaśiva, the 12th-century author of the *Siddhāntasārāvalī*. He tells us in that commentary that he also commented on the Paddhati of Brahmaśambhu; but no manuscript of this work has reached us. It is probable that this Trilocanaśiva is identical with the author of that name who wrote the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, a Saiddhāntika compendium on penances. On the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* we have a commentary by one Anantaśambhu, concerning whose date I can say only that he postdates Viśvanātha, since he quotes him. On the *Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśiva we have a commentary by Nirmalamani, another late South Indian author, possibly of the 16th or 17th century but certainly later than Viśvanātha, since he too quotes the *Siddhāntaśekhara*, and another by Kacchapeśvaraśiva of Kāñci (Kanchipuram), of whose date I can cite no evidence other than that he, like Nirmalamani, quotes Viśvanātha. On the *Varuṇapaddhati* of Varuṇaśiva we have in addition to the commentary of Vedajñāna II already mentioned another by a Bhaṭṭa Śivottama, for whose date we have no evidence other than the fact that his commentary is mentioned by Vedajñāna as his guide.

We also have compendia that prescribe the penances to be undertaken for intentional or accidental infringements of the rules binding initiates, and the rules governing the states of impurity occasioned by a death, the correct timing of the

various rituals, notably the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hrdayaśiva, the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Trilocanaśiva, the *Āsaucaandrikā* of Uttuṅgaśiva, and the *Āsaucaḍḍipikā* and *Śaivakālaviveka* of Vedajñāna II; and we have treatises that give us systematic analyses of questions concerning the ritual rights and obligations of the various social groups among the Śaivas, such as the *Antyeṣṭiprakaraṇa* on the various types of Śaiva cremation ritual and the periods of impurity that ensue, the *Varnāśramacandrikā*, which gathers and analyses evidence from Śaiva scriptural sources and Paddhatis bearing on the application of the Brahmanical caste-classes and disciplines within Saiddhāntika practice and in particular on the qualification of Śūdras (Vēḷālas) to receive Śaiva initiation and consecration to office, and the *Śaivasamnyāsapaddhati* of Śivāgrayogīndra Jñānaśivācārya, which establishes the related qualification of Śaiva Vēḷālas to enter the discipline of the renouncer.

## The Siddhānta's Pratiṣṭhātantras and Pratiṣṭhāpāddhatis

In addition to the general scriptural works of the Siddhānta we have a number of specialized scriptures called Pratiṣṭhātantras that treat only the rituals of installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) and such ancillary subjects as iconography, iconometry, and the plans of various types of temple, royal palaces, monasteries, and new settlements, from royal centers to villages. Of scriptures of this kind we have the *Devyāmata*, the *Mohaśūrottara*, the *Piṅgalāmata*, and the *Mayasaṃgraha*. The first three have reached us in their entirety, while for the *Mayasaṃgraha* we have at present only a single incomplete witness. We also have the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*, a commentary, fortunately complete, written on the whole of that work by the Kashmirian Vidyākāṇṭha, a pupil of the Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha who has given us commentaries on the *Kālottara*, *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, and *Kiraṇa*. Commentaries also existed on the *Piṅgalāmata* and the *Mohaśūrottara* by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha of Kashmir (or his son Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha) and Aghoraśiva of Chidambaram respectively, but neither of these, it seems, has reached us.

Here too we find a number of Paddhatis, works whose purpose, like that of those that pertain to the whole range of Saiddhāntika rituals, was to

provide fuller, more systematic coverage of the rituals, in this case those of installation alone, and of all that pertains to them. Notable in this category are the *Pratiṣṭhāsārapaddhati* composed in Banaras by a pupil of a Kumāraśiva who was a contemporary of Mūlarāja I, founder of the Caulukya dynasty of Gujarat, who ruled from 941 to 997/998 CE, the *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha* of the east Indian Vairocana, probably of the same century, the *Śaivāgamanibandhana* of Murāribhaṭṭa, probably a Keralan, and the *Prayogamañjarī* of the Keralan Ravi, written no later than the 15th century.

## Saiddhāntika Liturgical Hymnography

Within the corpus of surviving Saiddhāntika Śaiva sources we have also a small body of hymns (*stava*, *stuti*, → *stotra*) composed for recitation in the course of worship. The earliest will be the *Vyomavyāpistava* if the Rāmakaṇṭha to whom it is attributed by its 16th-century commentator Vedajñāna II is the Kashmirian Saiddhāntika Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. Of certain attribution are the *Pañcāvaraṇastotra* of Aghoraśiva and the *Śivapūjāstava* of his contemporary Jñānaśiva. Closely related is the *Dhyānaratnāvalī* of their pupil Trilocanaśiva, which consists of verses to be recited for the visualization of all the deities of the Saiddhāntika pantheon in the order in which they are worshipped.

## The Scriptures of the Non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga

The Siddhānta is strictly Śaiva, in the sense that the regular rites prescribed by its scriptures are focused on Śiva alone (in his mild five-faced and ten-armed Sadāśiva form), worshipped without his consort. The rest of the Mantramārga, which, as we shall see, has been variously classified by the Śaivas, comprises texts that teach cults with a Śākta-Śaiva orientation, whose deities are generally more ferocious in character and who for the most part differ from the Siddhānta's lacto-vegetarian Sadāśiva by requiring offerings such as meat and alcoholic liquor. They are principally the following:



1. the four goddesses Jayā, Vijayā, Ajitā (also called Jayantī), and Aparājītā (with their brother Tumburu);
2. Svacchandabhairava and his consort (Aghoreśvarī, Bhairavī);
3. Kapālīśabhairava and his consort Aghorī (Caṇḍā Kāpālīnī);
4. the triad of the goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā, with or without their Bhairava consorts; and
5. Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī (Kālī) and her many variants.

In the texts of all but the first of these cults we find to a greater or lesser extent elements of the cremation ground practices found in Atimārga II and III, practices lacking in the Saiddhāntika scriptures with the exception of the very early *Niśvāsa* corpus, in which the polarization of the Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika traditions seems not yet to have emerged.

With these non-Saiddhāntika works Śaiva accounts of the scriptural literature also group texts known as the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras concerned with therapeutic and exorcistic procedures, which invoke such wrathful Rudra forms as Nīlakaṇṭha, Khaḍgarāvaṇa, Lohaka, Krodheśvara, Devatrāsa, Aghora, and Jvareśvara.

In addition to texts of these traditions we have the *Netra* (also called *Amṛteśavidhāna* and *Mṛtyujit*), which teaches the cult of Amṛteśvara-bhairava and Amṛtalakṣmī. This text, which does not appear in any early account of the Śaiva canon and was produced in Kashmir between circa 700 and 850 CE, probably after 800, overrides the distinctions between the various branches of the Mantramārga listed here and that between the Mantramārga and the Kulamārga by propagating a form of worship for use by royal officiants that can be inflected as required to take on the character of any of these divisions and indeed of others outside Śaivism.

The texts of the non-Saiddhāntika traditions for the most part do not enter the territory of worship performed in temples for the public good, their cults being mostly conceived as courses of propitiatory worship to be undertaken by individuals in the private domain for the benefit of none but themselves or designated beneficiaries. Moreover, although the scriptures of the Siddhānta taught rituals for the accomplishment of supernatural effects, it was the non-Saiddhāntika scriptures that provided the most elaborate accounts of such rituals; and the ferocious character of

many of their deities no doubt rendered them particularly appealing to royal and other clients eager to invest in supernatural assistance against enemies and calamities. As a result we may say that in the Mantramārga's engagement with society rather than in the domain of personal religion the Siddhānta came to operate principally in the fields of regular piety, state legitimation, and social stability, aspiring to subsume and preserve the Brahmanical socio-religious order and therefore tending to free itself of the countercultural elements of its atimārgic antecedents, while the non-Saiddhāntika Śākta-Śaiva systems, which maintained and developed those elements, came to the fore in the domain of rituals commissioned to avert danger in response to particular events or as regular, institutionalized programmes of state protection.

This duality of function is not readily observed by reading the insiders' texts, since these belong to one or other of the divisions and all claim to be offering the same goals. But it can be detected not only in the greater emphasis on rituals for supernatural effects in the non-Saiddhāntika corpus but also, for example, in the ruling of the Saiddhāntika *Mṛgendra* that a person may inflect his worship to accomplish supernatural effects by propitiating Śiva in one or other of the secondary aspects of Sadāśiva considered to be the sources of the non-Saiddhāntika traditions, in the Saiddhāntika *Kālottara*'s brief account of how one may use the Saiddhāntika Mantra of the *Kālottara* system in non-Saiddhāntika Sādhana to attain supernatural effects by propitiating either Bhairava and the Mothers (*mātrkā*) or Tumburu and the Four Sisters (*bhāgini*), that is to say, the deities of the Dakṣiṇa or Vāma streams respectively, and in a passage in the anonymous commentary on the Saiddhāntika *Śataratnasamgraha* which distinguishes between the Siddhānta and the other four streams by saying that the first bestows liberation and the others the counteracting of poisons (by means of the Gāruḍatantras), the exorcising of dangerous spirits (by means of the Bhūtatantras), the subjecting of others to one's will (by means of the Vāmatantras), and the destruction of enemies (by means of the Dakṣiṇatantras, also called Bhairavatantras).

This same duality can be detected in the *Uttarārdha* of the Śaiva *Līṅgapurāṇa*. For that text in spite of its claim to be a Purāṇa covers Saiddhāntika worship as the norm and adds Bhairava-centered and Śākta rituals specifically

for the destruction of the king's enemies and the promoting of his victory in battle. Other examples of the role of the non-Saiddhāntika traditions in this domain are the cult of Bhadrakālī for the king's success in war seen in the *Āṅgirasakalpa* corpus of the Paippalādins of Orissa, the South Indian Mātṛtantra tradition, and the cult of Tumburu and his Sisters established for state protection in Cambodia early 9th century. We may compare in this regard the commissioning by kings in the Brahmanical domain both of status-enhancing Śrauta ceremonies and of atharva-vedic rituals performed by specialists in the office of the royal chaplain for the warding off of dangers of all kinds from the royal household and the kingdom.

Nonetheless, however great the divergence between the Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika cults of the Mantramārga in terms of their primary function or emphasis, they are essentially variants of a single ritual system.

## Classifications of the Mantramārga's Scriptures

### Five Streams (*srotas*)

Of the classifications of the Mantramārga's scriptures found in works within it the earliest and most comprehensive divides it into five streams of revelation held to have come forth from the mouths of the five faces of Sadāśiva: the scriptures of the Siddhānta, divided artificially into two sub-canon (the 10 Śivabhedas and the 18 Rudrabhedas) from the upper and upward-gazing Īśāna face – this then is a Saiddhāntika classification – and those of the non-Saiddhāntika systems from the four faces below, which look towards the cardinal directions: the Vāmatantras, teaching the cult of the four Sisters and their brother Tumburu from the north/left-facing mild Vāmadeva face, the Dakṣiṇatantras, teaching cults of Bhairavas and goddesses from the south/right-facing ferocious Aghora face, the Gāruḍatantras from the front/east-facing Tatpuruṣa face, and the Bhūtatantras from the rear/west-facing face of Sadyojāta. We find this classificatory schema in the *Śrīkaṇṭhī-Srotobheda* with long lists of the texts and subtexts in each category, in a shorter passage prefixed to a manuscript of the *Jñānapañcāśikā*, also seen in Vairocana's *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha*, giving only the primary texts in each division, in the *Mṛgendra*,

mentioning only one text as an example of each stream, and in a number of other Saiddhāntika sources, both scriptural and exegetical, that merely mention the classification and emphasise the superiority of the Siddhānta that it articulates.

### The Three Streams: Siddhānta, Vāma, Dakṣiṇa

In the non-Saiddhāntika scripture *Picumata*, also called *Brahmayāmala*, we encounter a modification of this classification evidently designed to express the view that the non-Saiddhāntika traditions are superior to the Saiddhāntika and to push the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras to the margin. It divides the Śaiva scriptures into three principal streams, central (*madhyama*), left (*vāma*) and right (*dakṣiṇa*), as emanations of three corresponding powers of the deity, termed Madhyamā, Vāmā, and Dakṣiṇā, in ascending order, assigning the Siddhāntatantras to the first, the Vāmatantras to the second, and the Dakṣiṇatantras, among which it counts itself, to the third. Ascent through this hierarchy is compared to the process of preparing rice. The system of the Śivabhedas and Rudrabhedas, that it to say, the Siddhānta, is likened to the removing of the husks (*tuṣa*) from the grains, that of the Vāmatantras to the cleaning of the grains by the removing of the bran (*kambūka*), and that of the Dakṣiṇatantras to the cooking of the pure white grains that remain. The Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras, together with a number of other tantric systems, including the Vaiṣṇava → Pañcarātra, are assigned to what it calls the lower stream (*adhaḥsrotas*).

### Siddhāntatantras and Bhairavatantras

Later classifications, of which there are two, submerge the Vāma within the Dakṣiṇa and reflect, I propose, a time when the former had become marginal, overtaken and engulfed by the forms of Śākta-Śaiva observance found in the Dakṣiṇatantras that carried forward the tradition of Atimārga III. Both classifications, like that of the *Picumata*, leave the Bhūtatantras and Gāruḍatantras out of their account, no doubt for the same reason. The first presents the canon in terms of a simple dichotomy between Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika Tantras, the former comprising ten Śivatantras, 18 Rudratatantras, and satellites of these, and the latter listed with evident artificiality as the 64 Bhairavatantras, divided into eight ogdoads. Vāmatantras are found among

the 64 listed in this classification, but the great majority are, or appear to be, works of Dakṣiṇa character.

### Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha

The second classification, while recognizing this basic dichotomy, subdivides the non-Saiddhāntika category into Bhairava-centered and Goddess-centered texts in works that belong to the latter subcategory. It articulates, then, a Śākta perspective on the canon. It divides the non-Saiddhāntika scriptures, excluding the Bhūtantrās and Gāruḍatantrās, into two collections termed Pīṭhas: the Mantrapīṭha for the Bhairava-centered tradition and the Vidyāpīṭha for the Goddess-centered. Texts assigned to the Vidyāpīṭha generally refer to themselves in their colophons as belonging to the Vidyāpīṭha within the Bhairava stream (*bhairavasrotas*), the latter term evidently denoting the whole non-Saiddhāntika corpus other than the Gāruḍatantrās and Bhūtantrās.

The Mantrapīṭha is dominated by the *Svacchanda*, also known as the *Lalitasvacchanda*, the Tantra of the cult of Svacchandabhairava and his consort Aghoreśvarī. This work is the preeminent text of this category in the scriptural accounts. It also the only one that has come down to us in its entirety. The only other works of this category that have reached us through citation or the incorporation of passages in compendia are its satellites: the *Aghoreśvarīsvacchanda*, the *Dvādaśasāhasra/Mantrapīṭhasvacchanda*, and the *Rasasvacchanda*.

The importance of the *Svacchanda* is evident (1) from the fact that it has come down to us in manuscripts in widely separated parts of the subcontinent, namely the Kathmandu Valley, Kashmir, and Tamil Nadu, (2) from the survival of various Paddhatis for worship and initiation based on it in the Kathmandu Valley, and, above all, in Kashmir, where it became, with the *Netra*, the principal basis of the rituals of the region's Śaivas down to recent times, and (3) from the fact that it is the unacknowledged source of much of the wording and content of the prescription of the ritual of Saiddhāntika initiation set out by Bhojadeva in his influential *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, stripped, of course, of all non-Saiddhāntika *mantras* and deities, these being replaced by those of the Saiddhāntika *Kālotara*.

The Vidyāpīṭha is divided into three subcollections in the only known account of it, which is contained in the first *ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*: the Vāmatantrās, Yāmalatantrās, and Śaktitantrās.

The first of these comprises, according to that source, three lead texts: the *Nayottara*, the *Mahāraudra*, and the *Mahāsaṃmohana*. The *Picumata* also recognizes three Tantras in this category: the *Saṃmoha*, the *Nayottara*, and the *Śaukra*. The Cambodian Sdok Kak Thom inscription of 1052 names four Vāma scriptures: the *Śiraścheda*, the *Vināśikha* (*sic* for *Vīṇāśikha*), the *Saṃmoha*, and the *Nayottara*, and implies by referring to them as the four mouths of the four-faced deity Tumburu that they were understood to constitute a complete canon, at least of the tradition's core texts.

Of these texts we now have only the *Vīṇāśikha*, which reaches us in an undated palm-leaf manuscript in a proto-Bengali hand of the 12th or 13th century. Since the *Vīṇāśikha* refers to the *Saṃmohana/Mahāsaṃmohana*, *Nayottara*, and *Śiraścheda* as its antecedents, we learn that it is the most recent of the four texts and that its absence from the Vāma canons of the *Jayadrathayāmala* and *Picumata* may be because it was not in existence when their accounts of the Śaiva revealed literature were drawn up.

We may safely assume that *Saṃmoha*, *Saṃmohana*, and *Mahāsaṃmohana* are variant titles of one and the same work. As for the *Śiraścheda*, the *Jayadrathayāmala* claims this as another name for itself. So might not this, or rather its first *ṣaṭka*, which is the original text to which the three subsequent *ṣaṭkas* were added, be the Vāmatantra referred to by the Sdok Kak Thom inscription and the *Vīṇāśikha*? The first *ṣaṭka* does refer to itself as a Vāma text. But this claim is hardly supported by its contents. For though there are some Vāma elements in the first *ṣaṭka* they are incidental and subordinated within a Dakṣiṇa framework. At best we can accept the *ṣaṭka*'s own characterization of itself in its listing of the Vidyāpīṭha's lead texts as a Vāma-Dakṣiṇa hybrid. Moreover, that same account speaks of the original *Śiraścheda* revelation's having split into two transmissions of which the available work represents only one. This may well have been intended to account for the existence of another, purely Vāma *Śiraścheda*, now lost.

We have, then, only one of the core scriptures of the Vāma canon. In addition we have testimony of a lost work whose title may tentatively be reconstructed as *\*Devītantrasadbhāva* in the form of a two-folio fragment of a birchbark manuscript, possibly from as early as the mid-6th century, containing a précis of this text, to be

discussed under the heading of Vāma exegesis, and also an incomplete 11th-century Nepalese manuscript of the *Siddhayantrārṇava* (The Ocean of Empowered Yantras), which attributes itself to the *Umātilaka* of the *Sam̐mohana* cycle.

The other two text groups in the *Vidyāpīṭha* are the *Yāmalatantras* and *Śaktitantras*. The lead texts of the first are said by the *Jayadrathayāmala* to be five: *Rudrayāmala*, *Brahmayāmala*, *Viṣṇuyāmala*, *Skandayāmala*, and *Umāyāmala*. The treatment of these in the *Jayadrathayāmala* makes it clear that the *Brahmayāmala* was the preeminent work of this class; and indeed it is this alone that has reached us intact, as a work of about 12,000 verses variously entitled *Brahmayāmala*, *Picumata*, and *Ucchuṣma*, surviving in a well-preserved Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript dated in 1052. We also have three of its satellite texts: the *Mahābhairavamāṅgalā*, the *Piṅgalāmata*, and the *Matasāra*, which teaches a cult of the same pantheon as the *Picumata* but with additions that are its signature.

The *Brahmayāmala* is strongly Kāpālika in character, carrying forward into the Mantramārga the antinomian and sanguinary culture of Atimārga III; and the relative antiquity of this current of mantramargic Śaivism is evident in many details of its doctrines and prescriptions. As to how old it is, the earliest verifiable citations of the work are found in the *Tantrāloka* of → Abhinavagupta, who was active in Kashmir around the late 10th and early 11th centuries CE; but it is mentioned indirectly, together with the *Viṣṇuyāmala* and *Rudrayāmala* in the hymn *Bhairavāvardhamānaka* that survives in a codex of 819 CE, and the earliest and probably original *Skandapurāṇa* of the 6th or early 7th century lists seven Mātṛtantras with -yāmala titles, beginning with the *Brahmayāmala*, all but two of which are named in accounts of the *Yāmalatantras* seen in our mantramargic sources.

Connected with this early *Brahmayāmala* are two texts under this title surviving in South India. These claim to be part of the *Brahmayāmala* and indeed are derived from it to the extent that they share its core pantheon and an number of other formal features; but they differ from it radically in that they prescribe a regular cult of Cāmuṇḍā/Bhadrakālī and the seven Mothers to be conducted before fixed idols in temples by non-Brahman priests of the Pārasava caste for the protection of the state and its subjects and the enhancement of royal power. The antiquity of

this South Indian variant of what was originally a purely private form of worship undertaken by individual initiates of any caste for their own benefit alone cannot be determined from the surviving manuscripts, but the textual prescriptions of the cult are closely reflected in two Tamil inscriptions that set out the provisions for the funding of the temple of the goddess Kolārammā at Kolar (Kolār) in Nolambavadi (Noḷambavāḍi), detailing the yearly allowances for the staff, who include a teacher of grammar and Yāmala, the deities, and the various ceremonies. The first is dated in the second regnal year of Kō-Rājakesarivarman, alias Rājendracoladeva (Kulottuṅga I), that is to say, in 1071/1072. The second is undated but appears to be the continuation of the first, recording the same witnesses to its provisions.

The third subcollection, that of the *Śaktitantras*, is said by the *Jayadrathayāmala* to contain seven lead texts: the *Sarvavīrasamāyoga*, the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, the *Pañcāmṛta*, the *Viśvāḍya*, the *Yoginijālaśaṃvara*, the *Vidyābheda*, and the *Śīraccheda*. Of these, two have reached us: (1) the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, in what is evidently a much shorter redaction that that which is frequently quoted in the Kashmirian exegetical literature, and (2) the *Śīraccheda*, otherwise known as the *Jayadrathayāmala*, at this stage only the work that would later be the first of four *ṣaṭkas* passing under this title.

These two are at the base of the other two traditions that are well-represented in our surviving sources. The first, taught in the former, is the cult of the goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā. This gave rise to the *Mālinīvijayottara*, which became the base scripture of the Śākta system known as the Trika, and is part of a larger corpus of scriptures that also includes the *Tantrasadbhāva* and, known for the most part only through citations and other testimonia, the *Triśīrobhairava*, the *Devyāyāmala*, the *Trikakularatnamālā*, the *Trikasadbhāva*, the *Trikasāra*, the *Yogasamcāra*, the *Bhairavakula*, and the *Virāvali*. In addition we have chapters from three other texts of this tradition assigned in their colophons to (the cycle of) the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* in Ḥṛdayaśiva's *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*: the *Bijabheda*, the *Bhairavodyāna*, and the *Trikasārottara*. We also have the *Parātrimṣikā/Parātriśikā* or *Anuttaratrimṣikā*, a short work teaching an essentialized form of Trika worship that is directed to the goddess Parā alone, a system also known as the Anuttara or Parākrama.



Finally, we have the *Vijñānabhairava*. This scripture is concerned entirely with the outlining of a 112 meditation exercises, with one verse for each, these being referred to as *nistarāṅgopadeśa* (teachings concerning the Waveless). It does not engage with the specifics of tantric ritual in a manner that would enable us to conclude that it is a work of the Trika or some other ritual tradition. But its Trika background is apparent from verses in which this transcendence of ritual is formulated as the transcendence of the Trika's ritual. This is, in other words, a Trika work that advocates practices that are free of the specifics of its *mantra* deities.

The second surviving Śāktitantra tradition, taught in the *Jayadrathayāmala*, also called *Tantrarāja* and *Tantrarājabhāṭṭāraka*, is that of the cult of the goddess Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī or Kālī. This, in its expanded form created by the addition of three subsequent *ṣaṭkas*, probably in Kashmir, adds a vast array of texts that prescribe the procedure to be followed for the propitiation of variant forms of this goddess and introduces material closely related to the Kaula tradition of Kālī worship known as the Kālikula, Krama, Mahānaya, Mahārtha, or Devīnaya, whose scriptural sources will be covered below under the literature of the Kulamārga.

As for the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras, pushed into the background by the non-Saiddhāntika classificatory systems, we have lists of titles both in the passage prefixed to a manuscript of the *Jñānapañcāśikā* and seen in Vairocana's *Lakṣaṇasaṃgraha* and, with lists of subtexts, in the *Śrīkaṇṭhi-Srotobhedā*; but nearly all of this extensive canon seems not to have reached us, the only survivors being two texts in Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts that claim to be parts of the *Trottala*, also known as the *Tottala*, *Trotula*, or *Totula*, a work that appears in the lists of the primary Gāruḍatantras and has been quoted by the Kashmirian scholar Kṣemarāja. These are the *Tvaritāmūlasūtra* and the *Tvaritājñānakalpa*. We also have the *Kriyākālaguṇottara*. This is not listed in the canonical accounts, but it contains material pertaining to both these streams, has been quoted by Kṣemarāja in his *Netroddyota*, and reaches us complete in a number of Nepalese manuscripts, the earliest penned in 1184/1185 for the preceptor of a feudatory ruler in the kingdom of Dhavalasrota in the west of Nepal. The assumption that its exorcistic sections draw

on our lost Bhūtatantras is supported by the fact that it includes a *Khaḍgarāvaṇakalpa* and a *Caṇḍāsīdhārakalpa*, sections devoted to the rites of the Rudras Khaḍgarāvaṇa and Caṇḍāsīdhāra. For Tantras bearing the names of these *mantra* deities are found in the canonical lists. There is evidence of the same kind of its having drawn on the lost Gāruḍatantras. For it also contains a *Devatrāsakalpa* and there is a *Devatrāsatantra* among the listed scriptures of that class.

In addition we have in other Śāiva scriptural sources, particularly the *Jayadrathayāmala*, a quantity of Gāruḍa material, that is to say, prescriptions whose purpose is devenomation and the control of snakes, both actual snakes and the mythical → *nāgas*, and through the latter the control of rainfall, believed to lie in their power, and hence the protection of crops. The working of such material into the major Tantras may account at least in part for the atrophy of the original sources.

## The Non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga's Exegesis

The exegetical literature on the non-Saiddhāntika Tantras may be presented most aptly within the categories given by the *Jayadrathayāmala*, since it is this perception of the components of the Śāiva revelation that the authors of this literature adopted, that is to say, in terms of the dichotomy between the Bhairava-centered Mantrapīṭha and the Devī-centered Vidyāpīṭha, and within the latter between the Tantras of the Vāma stream, the Yāmalatantras, and the Śāktitantras, and within the last, between the Trika and the cult of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī taught in the *Jayadrathayāmala* itself.

On the *Svacchanda*, the principal scripture of the Mantrapīṭha, we have an extensive and exhaustive commentary (*Svacchandoddyota*) composed by the Kashmirian Kṣemarāja (fl. c. 1000–1050). He refers to an earlier commentary on the text by Rājānaka Bhullaka, another Kashmirian, as his title Rājānaka reveals. No manuscript of his work has reached us. We have only its title – Kṣemarāja refers to it as *Bṛhaṭṭīkā* (Long Commentary) – and some of its interpretations, which Kṣemarāja cites to reject. We also have Kṣemarāja's commentary on the *Netra*, which though not explicitly claimed for the Mantrapīṭha – indeed this Tantra is

mentioned to my knowledge in no early account of the Śaiva canon – may nonetheless be considered as an auxiliary text of that division.

We have in addition a substantial body of Kashmirian Paddhatis based on either or both of these two Tantras, though they also incorporate ancillary material from Saiddhāntika and Śākta sources. Notable among these are the *Śiṣyasamskārapaddhati* for the neophyte's initiation (*samayadikṣā*), the *Kalādikṣāpaddhati*, originally composed by the Kashmirian Guru Manodadatta/Manoda in 1335/1336 and subsequently expanded with the development of somewhat divergent versions down to at least the 17th century, for the full initiations (*nirvāṇadikṣā* and *sādhakadikṣā*) and consecrations to office (*ācāryābhiṣeka*, *sādhakābhiṣeka*, and Śaiva *rājyābhiṣeka*), the anonymous *Agnikāryapaddhati* in full and abbreviated versions for the fire sacrifice, the *Śivanirvāṇapaddhati* for cremation, usually anonymous but sometimes attributed to a guru called Manohara, and, commonly transmitted with the last, Paddhatis covering the various rituals that follow cremation, from the offerings of the first ten days to the annual *śrāddha*. Based on the *Netra* we have in the *Gurupustikā/Gurupustaka* of Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha, a Kashmirian who was active circa 1375–1425, a comprehensive Paddhati, covering regular worship, penances, initiation, consecration of officiants, and installation. In the domain of the regular obligatory worship of initiates we have a Paddhati for the worship of Svachchandaabhairava, and, representing a variant tradition, an anonymous Paddhati setting out Śaiva worship both regular (*nityapūjā*) and on special occasions (*naimittikapūjā*) such as the annual *śivarātri* festival, the first centered on Amṛteśabhairava (*Netrabhaṭṭāraka*) and the second on Sakalāsvachchanda, his consort Aghoresvarī, and Niṣkalāsvachchanda drawn from the *Svacchanda*, culminating in the worship of a new form not found there, namely Mahāsvachchandaabhairava, which has its own, postclassical scripture, the *Vṛddhasvacchanda*, and which combines in one seven-faced and thirty-six-armed figure not only Svachchandaabhairava but also the Nārasimha and Vārāha faces of the trademark Vaikuṇṭha icon of Kashmirian Pāñcarātri Vaiṣṇavism, the face of the sun (*Kulamārtaṇḍabhairava*) representing the Saura tradition, and the face of Heruka embodying the Buddhism of the Yoginītantras, an innovation not found in any of the other Kashmirian Paddhatis mentioned here.

Nepal too has preserved *Svacchanda*-based Paddhatis for the worship of Svachchandaabhairava, notably the *Svacchandadevārcanavidhi* and *Svacchandadevalakṣahomayāga*, and *Netra*-based Paddhatis for the worship of Amṛteśvarabhairava: the *Apratihata mahādikṣāsuṭippaṇaka*, also called *Netroddyota*, of Viśveśvara, probably of the 12th century, and the *Amṛteśvarapūjana* composed by the Nepalese king Abhayamalla (r. 1216–1255). Other relevant manuscripts in this category are the *Amṛteśvarapūjāgnikāryavidhāna*, the *Amṛtasūryapūjāvidhi* with drawings of the deities, and the *Pūjākāṇḍa*, which contains an *Amṛtabhairavārcanavidhi* penned in 1277/1278, an *Amṛtiśabhairavabhaṭṭārakāhnikavidhi*, and an *Amṛtasūryārcanavidhi*.

Within the Vidyāpīṭha we have no exegetical material on the scriptures of its Vāma division other than the fragment already mentioned, the first two folios of a work that we may call *\*Devītantrasadbhāvasāra* – its title is not contained in the surviving portion – because it claims at its beginning to be a precis in the *āryā* meter of the key parts (*sāra*) of what it calls *devīnām tantrasadbhāvam* (“the essence of the Tantras of the goddesses”). The latter appears to have been a scriptural work, since our fragment describes it as having been received from Śiva by a sage who is described as the adornment of the line of Atri and is therefore probably Durvāsas, the son of Atri, who is widely encountered in the role of the intermediary through whom Śiva's teachings have reached mankind. The identification of the text as a work in the Vāma tradition is secured by its subject matter, since that is the attaining of supernatural effects (*siddhi*) through the correct formation and modification of the *mantras* of Tumburu, his four Sisters, and the secondary deities of that pantheon of worship. Though our text claims to be only a precis, and indeed preserves the form of its source to the extent that it begins after the opening verses in the manner of scripture as a dialogue in which Śiva teaches in response to the sage's enquiry, its declaration of intent in the opening verses and the choice of the *āryā* meter both suggest that this work wished to be seen as a product of human learning rather than as scripture. This work reaches us from a very early period in the development of the Mantramārga. For the two birchbark folios, which were preserved against all odds by inclusion in the famous mass of Buddhist manuscripts, mostly fragmentary, discovered in 1931 by shepherds in a ruined *stūpa* near Gilgit in the Gilgit-Baltistan territory

of Pakistan, are written in an early variety of the Kashmirian script whose archaic features suggest that it may be as early as the mid-6th century CE. In that case it is older by three centuries than what are otherwise our oldest tantric Śaiva manuscripts, those that have survived from the 9th century in Nepal: *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*, *Sarvajñānottara*, *Pārameśvara*, and *Mahābhairavamaṅgalā*.

Up to the 8th century at least this tradition enjoyed considerable popularity in the Indian subcontinent, and also in Southeast Asia, where it may have lingered for several centuries. We can infer this popularity from a wide range of evidence found in Buddhist, Jaina, and Brahmanical textual sources, and also, in the case of Southeast Asia, in inscriptions. However, evidence from the 10th century and after suggests that by then the Vāma system had faded from view. The surviving works of the Śaiva exegetes of this period make no references to its primary texts in their citation-rich works; and this silence is particularly striking in the case of the digests of Hṛdayaśiva and Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. The former's *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* draws extensively on the whole range of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga, both Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha, but includes no Vāma text. The same applies to Takṣakavarta's *Nityādisaṃgraha*, except that he has included a long passage from a *Vīṇāśikhottara*, which is a Vāma text if we may judge from its title alone, though it contains nothing that proves or indicates that affiliation. In his detailed presentation of scriptural sources bearing on the regular duties of initiates he illuminates only worship that follows the Siddhānta, the *Svacchanda*, or the *Netra*. Nor to my knowledge have any of the South Indian authors from the 11th century onwards cited Vāma scripture. The same absence is seen in the Saiddhāntika Paddhati *Vimalāvatī* of the east Indian Vimalaśiva (1101/1102), although he, like the Saiddhāntika Hṛdayaśiva, has cited numerous non-Saiddhāntika works of the Mantrapīṭha, the Vidyāpīṭha, and the Kulamārga.

The Yāmala division of the Vidyāpīṭha seems also to have fared poorly in the times of our exegetes, though not as poorly as the Vāmatantras. We have no commentary on the *Brahmayāmala*, and no report of one in our sources. But the text was still well known around the turn of the 1st and 2nd millennia, since it is cited quite frequently by Abhinavagupta. Moreover, its deities were sufficiently important in Kashmir to enter, albeit as a minor element, the region's *Svacchanda*-based Paddhatis. Its chief goddess

Caṇḍā Kāpālīnī is included among the recipients of oblations in the *Agnikāryapaddhati* and the *Śivarātripūjāpaddhati*; and she is worshipped with her four subordinates Raktā, Karālā, Caṇḍākṣī, and Mahocchuṣmā and their attendants (*dūtīs*) Karālī, Danturā, Bhīmavaktrā, and Mahābalā as the deities of the *śrāddha* lamp in the Kashmirian Śaivas' *śivadīpaśrāddha*.

The *Brahmayāmala* materials derived from this source whose context is the South Indian tradition of temple-based Yāmala worship have also reached us without a commentary. However, we do have the *Māṭṛsadbhāva*, an explanatory work of professed human authorship that sets out to provide a summary account of the rituals of this tradition as found in various Yāmala texts, collating their teachings, which, we are told, are not complete in any one of these sources, to present a comprehensive, ordered account of the cult of the Mothers. When compared to the scriptural texts of this tradition the *Māṭṛsadbhāva* differs primarily not only in its lucid and generally correct Sanskrit but also in its extensive expurgation of most of the strongly Kāpālīka elements of this tradition while in spite of this recalling the tradition's roots in Atimārga III by, for example, describing the officiant as "one who has mastered the Somasiddhānta." The expurgation of counter-Brahmanical elements and the fact that it survives in Kerala and is cited in the Keralan tantric Paddhati literature inclines me to think that the work was produced in that region among the Nambūtiri Brahmins. As for its date, I can say at present only that it predates the 15th-century Keralan author Śaṅkaran Nambūtiri, since he refers to it as the principal authority for the Keralan tradition of the worship of the Mothers accompanying Cāmuṇḍā/Bhadrakālī as the slayer of the *daitya* Ruru, Rurujit. However, the text or one or more of the lost Yāmala texts on which it draws, has a wider geographical horizon. For it relates the myth of the conquest of the *daitya* enemies of the gods by Cāmuṇḍā/Karṇamoṭī and the other Mothers at Koṭivarṣa (Kotivarsha) in the far north of Bengal, that of the origin of its sacred Śūlakuṇḍa ("Pool of the Trident") and the drinking of its water, the granting of the boon to the *māṭṛkas* as the reward for their victory that those who worship them with devotion will attain whatever *siddhi* they desire and salvation at death, and the presence there of Śiva together with the Mothers as the Bhairava Hetukeśvara. This material, probably in its original form, appears in the *Skandapurāṇa* of the 6th or early 7th century in

its account of how Cāmuṇḍā/Bahumāṃsā and the other Mothers came to be worshipped with the rites of the Yāmalatantras. The memory of Koṭivarṣa as the source of the tradition is also embedded in the ritual system. For when the Śākta sacred sites are installed one by one in vases on the site of worship Koṭivarṣa is to be in the central vase surrounded in the directions by Prayāga (Prayag) and the rest.

In the manuscript in which I have accessed this text the *Māṭṛsadbhāva* is followed by a *Balikālpa*, a prose Paddhati that sets out the procedure for the making of *bali* offerings in a temple of the goddess established following this tradition. There are certainly other Keralan materials of this kind awaiting recognition or close study, such as the *Rurujidvidhānapūjāpaddhati* governing the procedures for the cult of Cāmuṇḍā and the Mothers and the already published Paddhati of that cult that occupies *paṭalas* 7–9 of the *Śeṣasamuccaya* and its autocommentary composed by Śaṅkaran Nambūtiri in the 15th century.

As for exegesis in the Śāktitantra division of the Vidyapīṭha, we have an abundance in the case of the Trika, the system of worship represented by the *Siddhayogeśvarimata* in the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s list of primary scriptures (*mūlasūtra*). We have no commentary on that work itself. But on the *Mālinīvijayottara*, which rightly places itself in the cycle of that text, we have in the *Tantrāloka*, *Mālinīśloka-vārttika*, and *Tantrasāra* of the Kashmirian Abhinavagupta, active circa 975–1025 CE, what is undoubtedly the most extensive, elaborate, intellectually sophisticated, and influential exegesis in the Śaiva literature. Though these works are formally exegesis of the *Mālinīvijayottara* alone they develop on that base a comprehensive Śākta Śaivism that subsumes within itself the entire Mantramārga, both Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika, and grounds this complex both in the Kulamārga, drawing strongly on the Kālī-focused form of that tradition known as the Krama, and in the doctrine of dynamic nondual consciousness expounded philosophically by Somānanda, Utpaladeva, and Abhinavagupta himself. We also have an elaborate commentary (*vivaraṇa*) by Abhinavagupta on the *Parātrīṃśikā*, the scripture of the Trika subsystem known as the Parākrama or Anuttara. But that lies in the domain of the Kulamārga.

The Trika system expounded in the *Tantrāloka* had a great impact on Śākta-Śaiva theory in Kashmir and throughout the subcontinent in

subsequent centuries, but it seems not to have put down deep roots in Kashmir as a system of ritual-based observance. Apart from the vast running commentary of Rājānaka Jayaratha on the whole of this text, written in Kashmir in the 13th century, we have no other Trika works from that region; and even this commentary suggests that its author was not an initiate in the Trika as a living system of rituals, his own ritual expertise being rather in the cult of the goddess Tripurasundarī, to which we shall return. The *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* that guided Śaiva initiation in Kashmir until, in the first quarter of the 20th century, that ceremony ceased to be performed, recognizes that some initiands passing through its *Svacchanda*-based ceremonies retained a connection with the Trika, probably through family tradition, and so ordains that in their case the officiant should insert during the fire sacrifice some additional oblations for the Trika's principal *mantra* deities; but it is a striking fact that this is one of the very rare evidences of Trika ritual practice in Kashmir. Among the many Kashmirian manuscripts that have reached us I have encountered no Paddhati for the regular worship or initiation ceremonies of this tradition.

On the *Vijñānabhairava*, the Trika scripture concerned with meditation practices, there was a commentary by Abhinavagupta's pupil Kṣemarāja, of which only the commentary on the introductory 23 verses is known to have reached us. Śivopadhyāya, a Kashmirian author writing during the governorship of Sukhajivana (1753–1762), tells us that he could find no manuscript that contained more and so composed a work in which he added to the surviving portion of Kṣemarāja's work his own commentary on the remaining verses (24–163). We have another commentary (*Vijñānakaumudī*), written on the whole work by the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭāraka Ānanda in 1672, during the time of Akbar.

As for exegesis on the *Jayadrathayāmala*, the other Śāktitantra that has reached us in manuscripts, its huge extent and encyclopaedic character may have discouraged any aspiration to write a running commentary on the whole. Nonetheless some exegesis on the teachings of this Tantra has reached us. We have the *Bhuvanamālinī-kalpaviśamapadavivṛti* of the Kashmirian Śrīvatsa, a commentary on the chapter of the fourth *ṣaṭka* that gives the text for the rites of Bhuvanamālinī, also known as Dikṣādevī, which served among the



Śaiva officiants of Kashmir as a brief substitute for the elaborate form of *Svacchanda*-based initiation to be adopted in times of hardship or emergency. We also have Nepalese manuscripts of an anonymous *Jayadrathayāmala* *prastāra* *mantra-saṃgraha*. This work, probably Kashmirian, comments on and decodes the passages of the work that give the *mantras* of its numerous deities in encrypted form, covering the whole text, though not exhaustively, and also provides line drawings of some of the encryption diagrams (known as *prastāra*) referred to in the text. The manuscripts that contain this useful manual preface it with the *Tantrarājatantrāvatārastotra*, a hymn to the tradition of this Tantra by one Viśvāvarta, whose name reveals him to have been a Kashmirian. This states the first *ṣaṭka*'s view of its position in the Śaiva canon and adores what it takes to be the principal Kālīs of the four *ṣaṭkas*: Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī in the first, Siddhalakṣmī in the second, the three goddesses, Trailokyaḍamarā, Matacakreśvarī, and Ghoraghoratarā, in the third, and, in the fourth, Siddhayogeśvarī and the Krama's innermost pantheon of the 13 Kālīs. Finally, a section of Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka*, though it is a work of the Trika, is a Paddhati following the *Mādhavakula*, a Kaula text contained in the fourth *ṣaṭka*, though it is not beyond doubt that it was already part of the *Jayadrathayāmala* at that time.

That the text was influential in Kashmir can be seen in the fact that a number of the forms of Kālī the procedure for whose worship it teaches were taken into the *Svacchanda*-based *Agnikāryapaddhati* that guided until recent times the fire sacrifices performed in the major Śaiva ceremonies. In the section of that sacrifice in which goddesses are worshipped with oblations of clarified butter (*devīnām ājyahoma*) we find several of the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s deities, namely Bhuvanamālīnī, Pāpāntakārīnī, Vidyāvidyeśvarī, Vāgbhaveśvarī, Vāgīśī, Siddhalakṣmī, Mantramātṛkā, Mantraḍamarikā, Saptakoṭīśvarī, Bhāgyādhirohiṇī and Nityākālī. The sections in the Paddhatis devoted to each of these goddesses use verse passages from the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s treatments of their worship as recitation texts for the goddesses' gratification (*tarpaṇaśloka*) when making the oblations to them into the fire, and give their *mantras*, both the primary (*mūlamantra*) and the six ancillaries (*ṣaḍaṅgas*). We also have a Kashmirian *Jayadrathayāmala*-based Paddhati for the worship of Siddhalakṣmī (*Siddhalakṣmīpūjapaddhati*) and a so-called

*Pratyāṅgirāstotra*, which contains materials on the four *pratyāṅgirās* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, namely Siddhalakṣmī, Mantramātṛkā, Mantraḍamarikā, and Saptakoṭīśvarī, giving the *mantras*, visualizations, and ritual procedure, drawing on this scripture but also going beyond it. Thus its text for the visualization (*dhyāna*) of Mantraḍamarikā accords with the prescription of the *Mantraḍamarikāpāṭala* of the third *ṣaṭka* but is an independent composition, and supplements that text by supplying the weapons in four of her sixteen hands, which are unspecified there. In the case of Saptakoṭīśvarī it supplies a visualization verse not found there. These materials exhibit accurate interpretation of the text of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, since while that gives the *mantras* in encrypted form the Kashmirian Paddhatis report them as they are.

The cults of the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s goddesses were by no means restricted to Kashmir. A detailed view of the geographical range of this tradition, as of most tantric traditions, is not possible from the materials currently known; but we have abundant evidence of the importance of the cult of the goddess Siddhalakṣmī in the kingdoms of the Kathmandu Valley down to modern times, where she is generally referred to with a small inaccuracy as Siddhilakṣmī. She was adopted as a royal deity and her worship, in conjunction with that of Kubjikā, Guhyakālī, and Tripurasundarī, appears in the ritual manuals of the Newars as the constant frame in which other rituals are contained. Moreover, of these royal goddesses, Guhyakālī too is *Jayadrathayāmala*-based to the extent that the goddess and her cult, though not found in the *Jayadrathayāmala*, are very much in its spirit and draw heavily upon it.

As for post-scriptural literature in the traditions of the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtantrās we have a rich tradition of learned exposition among the Nambūtiri Brahmins of Kerala in the Mantravāda section of, or rather added to, the *Siddhāntasāra* of the Keralan Īśānaśiva and in the *Tantrasārasaṃgraha* or *Nārāyaṇīya* (*nārāyaṇīyo mantravāda*) of Nārāyaṇa of Śivapura (Shivapura) with the commentary *Mantravimarśinī* of Vāsudeva, which owes its title according to its author to the fact that it is a summary (*sārasaṃgraha*) of the teachings of such Tantras as the *Śikhāyoga*, which is one of titles in the canonical lists of the Gāruḍatantras. We have also the *Samhitāsāra*, a work in fine Prakrit verse by Śaṅkuka, which, as its title and content

declare, claims to have extracted the essentials from the Gāruḍa scriptures, with an anonymous Sanskrit commentary which almost certainly was written by a Kashmirian, probably in the 10th or 11th century, surviving in an undated but probably early 12th-century Nepalese manuscript. The *Yogarātnāvalī* of Śrīkaṇṭhaśambhu, perhaps a Keralan, does the same in Sanskrit for both the Gāruḍatantras and the Bhūtatantras in its first and second chapters respectively.

## The Kulamārga

As for the Kulamārga, its texts share with those of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga the counter-Brahmanical character of its offerings and overtures. But it is more extreme in this regard and also departs markedly by following a distinct ritual system, which was inherited, I propose, with some modifications and additions, from the Kāpālika Atimārga III. It is found both in its own independent texts (the Kulaśāstras), such as the *Kulapañcāśikā*, the *Kulasāra*, the *Kulānanda*, the *Kaulajñānanirṇaya*, and the *Timirodghāṭana*, and within texts of Śākta orientation that are assigned to the Mantramārga such as the *Mālinīvijayottara* and the second, third, and fourth *ṣaṭkas* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, so that in such traditions we are offered two distinct cults of their deities, one following the Mantramārga and the other, seen as more elevated, following the Kulamārga. In the latter, instead of the elaborate and time-consuming process of initiation through offerings into a consecrated fire (*hautrī dīkṣā*) seen throughout the Mantramārga, we see initiation through → possession (*āveśa*) by the goddess and the consumption of “impure” sacramental substances (*caruprāśana*, *vīrapāna*). We also find sexual intercourse with a consecrated consort (*dūtī*) as a central element of private worship, sanguinary sacrifices, and collective orgiastic rites celebrated by assemblies of initiates and women of low caste. The proposition that the essentials of this ritual system were carried forward from the Kāpālika tradition of the Somasiddhānta (Atimārga III) must be argued in detail elsewhere. Here I merely point out that the salient features of the latter show a marked similarity between the two traditions, setting them apart from the rest of Śaivism. These features are in brief:

1. erotic ritual with a female companion;
2. sanguinary practices for the propitiation of the fierce gods Mahābhairava/Bhairava and Cāmuṇḍā;

3. the notion that supernatural powers may be attained through the extraction by yogic means of the vital essences of living beings;

4. initiation through the consumption of consecrated liquor; and

5. the centrality of states of possession.

Here we may seem to be in the presence of a purely personal, largely secret, and mystical cult. But, as in the cults of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārga, the public value of this form of Śaivism for the protection of society and the state is also stressed.

The texts of the Kulamārga, also called the Kula teaching (Kulaśāsana, Kulāmnāya, and the like), or simply the Kula, were focused on the propitiation of the goddess Kuleśvarī with or without Bhairava (Kuleśvara) surrounded by the eight Mothers, and attended by Gaṇeśa and Vaṭuka, with ancillary worship of the four *yuganāthas* (the *siddhas* who propagated the tradition in the four ages) together with their consorts, ending with Macchanda and Koṅkaṇā in the present *kaliyuga*, and the six non-celibate *rājaputras* who were the sons of this couple, together with their consorts; but in course of time this was variously inflected and modified in liturgical systems differentiated most obviously by the identity of the central deity. Thus in an early classification, seen in the *Ciñcīṇimata*, we are given accounts of four systems of Kaula teaching, called the Āmnāyas (“Traditions”), assigned to the four directions, east (Pūrvāmnāya), north (Uttarāmnāya), west (Paścimāmnāya), and south (Dakṣiṇāmnāya), each with a distinctive pantheon of worship.

Of these the Pūrvāmnāya as outlined in this text appears to be the uninflected, original form of the Kula; and it is closely related to that which was taught for the Trika by the *Mālinīvijayottara* (11.3–16), Abhinavagupta’s *Tantrāloka* (29.18–55), and Jayaratha’s commentary thereon. Indeed there is textual continuity between this part of the *Ciñcīṇimata* and the passages of the *Kulakriḍāvatāra*, a text that has not otherwise survived to my knowledge, which Jayaratha quotes at length in his commentary on this section of the *Tantrāloka* to provide the scriptural authority that remains unstated in Abhinavagupta’s presentation. The only significant difference is that the Trika has superimposed its own distinctive *mantra* deities on to the underlying model.

The Kashmirian Śākta Śaiva exegetes of the 9th to 11th centuries do not use this classification into Āmnāyas. But later Kashmirian sources do support the close connection between the Trika and the Pūrvāmnāya that I am proposing. The

*Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* tells us that at a certain point in the preparatory rituals offerings into fire should be made in the case of the Pūrvāmnāya, that is to say, in the case of adherents thereof, to the three Bhairavas (Bhairavasadbhāva, Ratiśekhara, and Navātman), three goddesses (Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā), and Māṭṛsadbhāva. These, as the text of the Mantras that follows this statement shows, are the core *mantra* deities that define the Trika. Likewise in a fragmentary birchbark manuscript that contains parts of the text guiding the Kashmirian *śivarātri* worship as performed by Śaiva initiates we find the Trika's alphabet goddess Mālinī receiving offerings as the goddess of the Pūrvāmnāya after the recitation of a meditation verse that identifies her with the Trika's high goddess as embodied in the three goddesses enthroned on the lotuses on the tips of the trident at the center of the Trika's initiation → *maṇḍala* as the nondual ground of the agent, means, and object of cognition. Mālinī is also worshipped as the goddess of the Pūrvāmnāya in the Kashmirian Śaiva *gurus' Agnikāryapaddhati*, in the section on the fire offerings of clarified butter to the goddesses (*devinām ājyahoma*), with a meditation verse addressed to Parā, the Trika's highest goddess, as embodied in her seed syllable *sauḥ*.

The Trika produced several scriptures with a predominantly or exclusively Kaula orientation. Unfortunately these survive for the most part only in citations in the *Tantrāloka* and Jayaratha's commentary thereon. The principal among them are the *Triśirobhairava*, the *Trikakularatnamālā*, the *Yogasamcāra*, the *Trikasāra*, the *Bhairavakula*, and the *Virāvalikula*. The citations do not reveal much about the character of these texts on the level of the specifics of ritual; but we can at least see that the *Virāvalikula* was considered to pertain to a higher form of Kaula practice in which external elaborations were rejected in favor of inner experience. Thus in initiation the *Virāvali* advocated in place of the outer Kula's method of possession (*āveśa*), in which there occurs a paralysis (*stobha*) of the initiand's physical agency as his body and consciousness are taken over by the goddess, a higher method of spontaneous fusion of the initiator's and initiand's consciousness (*sāmarasya*). This evidence of distinction between different levels of practice within the Trika is confirmed by a passage in the *Siddhakhaṇḍa* of the Paścimāmnāya-Kaula *Manthānabhairava*. For that teaches a ladder of higher and higher means of liberation in which the Bhairavatantras are

followed in ascending order by the methods of the *Mālinīvijayottara*, the *Bhairavakula*, and the *Virāvali*, with the last transcended in turn by the Krama, and that by the form of Kaula practice espoused by the *Manthānabhairava* itself.

The Paścimāmnāya, with which the *Ciñciṇimata* aligns itself, is that of the cult of the goddess Kubjikā and her consort Navātman, a system whose scriptural corpus comprises principally the *Kubjikāmata*, *Laghvikāmnāya*, and *Ṣaṣṣāhasrakulālikāmnāya*, but also such works as the *Śrīmatottara/Gorakṣasamhitā*, *Kularatnodyota*, and *Manthānabhairava*. The last contains several remarks that reveal its provenance to be the Deccan plateau, more specifically Deśa (Desh), the central subregion of the modern state of Maharashtra. It tells us that it is in the Deccan (*dakṣiṇāpatha*) that the initiatory tradition (*ājñā*) of the Kubjikā cult is maintained; that it is "here in Deśa" that *siddhi* can be achieved; that those in the Konkan, the coastal region of Maharashtra, Goa, and Karnataka, should travel up to the Deccan plateau to obtain the scriptures, since without them this tradition will bear no fruit; and that the *Khañjinimata* of 24,000 verses, which was brought back to earth from the subterranean paradise at the beginning of the current *kaliyuga*, is (already) well known in the Deccan in the form of the *Kulālikāmata*, its redaction in 3,500 verses. That redaction is surely the *Kubjikāmata* in the principal of its three redactions. That and that alone is of this length; and it is referred to in its colophons with the synonym *Kulālikāmnāya*. That the *Manthānabhairava* was composed in the Deccan is confirmed by its practice of compounding the names of goddesses with -avvā. This is surely a reflex of the vernacular usage in this region, where goddess names of this kind are commonplace, *avvā* ("mother") being used in Kannara as a feminine title of respect and affection. This feature is also found in the *Kubjikāmata*. It is probable, then, that it too is a product of the Deccan, and therefore that the whole tradition emerged and developed in that region. This should be taken to include the Konkan. For the claim of the *Siddhakhaṇḍa* that those in the Konkan should go to Deśa for this Tantra admits that teaching is found in the Konkan too, claiming only that the best tradition is to be found inland. Moreover, the *Ṣaṣṣāhasrasamhitā* begins with the information that it was at Candrapurī/Candrapura in the Konkan, probably the ancient port town of Goa now called Chandor, that Śrīnātha first

propagated this teaching at the beginning of the current *kaliyuga*.

This evidence establishes, moreover, that the Trika (Pūrvāmnāya) was present in the Deccan, and that it was so before the literature of the Paścimāmnāya was redacted. For the *Kubjikāmata* drew extensively on the Trika's scriptures, embedding the cult of its deities in a modified Trika substrate. Nor is there good reason, in spite of the later prominence of the Trika in Kashmir, to suppose that it must have travelled from Kashmir to the Deccan before it exerted this influence. There is no need, then, to seek a connection with Kashmir to explain the fact that the Jaina Somadevasūri has referred to the Trika in his *Yaśastilaka*, completed in 959 CE at Gaṅgādhārā (Gangadhara), near Vemulawada in the Karimnagar district of Andhra Pradesh.

The *Ciñciṇīmata*'s account of the Uttarāmnāya shows this to be the system for the worship of the goddess Kālī (Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī) known variously as the Krama, Mahānaya, Mahārtha, Devīnaya, or Kālikula that we find in a number of liturgical variants in parts of the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s later *ṣaṭkas*, the *Kālikākulapañcaśataka*, the *Devīdyardhaśatikā*, the *Kālikulakramasadbhāva*, the *Yonigahvara*, and, known only through their utilization in the Paddhati *Kālikulakramārcana* of Vimalaprabodha, the *guru* of King Arimalla of Nepal (r. 1200–1216), the *Pañcācāmarāśekhara*, *Dvīpamata*, *Dvīpottara*, *Śaktikaulika*, *Kaulakamala*, *Kharapuccha*, and *Mahārthakramabheda*.

The *Kālikākulapañcaśataka* and *Kālikulakramasadbhāva* identify Uḍḍiyāna, that is to say, the Swat Valley, in the far northwest of the subcontinent, as the place of their revelation. But there are several pieces of evidence that encourage us to suspect that this is myth rather than fact. In Vimalaprabodha's account in the *Kālikulakramārcana* of the Krama ritual in which male and female adepts are worshipped collectively with offerings of food and drink (*cakrakraḍḍā*) he gives a secret jargon (*samayachommaka*) that should be used by the sponsor with all the invited participants to refer to the five phases of the Krama, from emission (*sṛṣṭi*) to radiance (*bhāsā*). The expressions are unmistakably Dravidian, and probably from the Kannara- or Tulu-speaking areas of the Deccan. The *Manthānabhairava*, a work of the Deccan, knows the Krama, placing it, as we have seen, between the Trika and itself in its ascending hierarchy of revelation, even redacting in its *Siddhakhaṇḍa* a Krama scriptural text

of 115 verses of which most are found in the *Devīdyardhaśatikā*. Finally, the *Ūrmikaulārṇava*, also called *Bhogahasta*, teaches a version of the Krama that it associates with the sacred site of the goddess Mahālakṣmī at Kolhapur in the Deccan, saying that it had been brought by *siddhas* to this place from the site of its original revelation by Śrīnātha in Assam (Kāmarūpa).

The last of the four, the Dakṣiṇāmnāya, is presented by the *Ciñciṇīmata* as the cult of Kāmeśvari surrounded by Kāmadeva and the 11 goddesses known as the Nityās, a tradition of whose literature we now possess only a single incomplete manuscript of one work, the *Nityākaula*. This cult was eclipsed in time by its own outgrowth, the cult of the goddess Tripurā/Tripurasundarī (see → Śrīvidyā), which eventually became much the most widespread and popular form of Śākta worship, surviving with some vigour down to the present. This later form, whose primary scriptures are the *Nityāśoḍaśikārṇava* and the *Yoginīhṛdaya*, did not assign itself to the Dakṣiṇāmnāya. Rather it claimed from the beginning that it transcends the Āmnāyas as the essence and embodiment of all four; and this stance was elaborated in the learned exegesis in the claim that the constituent parts of Tripurā's *maṇḍala* of nine intersecting triangles, known as the *śrīcakra*, are the embodiment of these four, equated with the four phases of emission (*sṛṣṭi*), stasis (*sthiti*, *avatāra*), retraction (*saṃhāra*), and the nameless (*anākhyā*), a tetrad borrowed from the Krama, thus transforming the *maṇḍala* into a proof, as it were, of the cult's claim to encompass and surpass all the other Kaula traditions.

This claim that the four Āmnāyas are embodied in the constituent parts of the *śrīcakra* is purely theoretical or rhetorical, since no deities or *mantras* from those traditions are incorporated. However, in the *Jñānārṇava*, a scriptural work of this tradition that shows additional elements not found in the system set out in the *Nityāśoḍaśikārṇava* and *Yoginīhṛdaya* and which is no doubt later than both of them for this reason and because it is not cited by the early exegetes, an attempt has been made to provide a more graphic expression of this belief by working the goddesses of the four Āmnāyas into the liturgy as subordinates of Tripurā. What is striking in this, however, is not the mere fact that this has been done but the fact that in doing so the redactors of the tradition reveal that by their time while the concept of the four Āmnāyas was alive only the Paścimāmnāya



and Uttarāmnāya out of the four identified by the *Ciñciṇimata* were familiar to them as active traditions. This we can infer from the fact that Kubjikā and Kālī are given there as the goddesses of those two Āmnāyas with their root *mantras* correctly recorded, while the other two Āmnāyas are filled in with goddesses and *mantras* created or adopted for this purpose without precedent in those traditions as evidenced in early sources, namely with Unmanī in the Pūrvāmnāya and Bhoginī in the Dakṣiṇāmnāya. We may surmise that the Dakṣiṇāmnāya had disappeared from view through its transformation into this ascendant cult of Tripurasundarī. As for the Pūrvāmnāya, the earliest and least elaborate of these systems, it had perhaps died out as an independent tradition, outmoded in the face of these later Śākta developments.

Both this claim to transcend the four Āmnāyas and the obsolescence of the old Dakṣiṇāmnāya and Pūrvāmnāya are confirmed by another and independent account of the Āmnāya system found in the *Parātāntra*, also referred to as the *Karavīrayāga*, a work probably composed within the Newar community of the Kathmandu valley at some time during the Malla period (1200–1768), probably in its latter half. It presents the four Āmnāyas as the traditions of the goddesses that preside over them and these goddesses as seated on lion thrones (*siṃhāsana*) located in the corresponding cardinal directions. Tripurā is introduced after chapters devoted to those four as the goddess of the upper lion throne (*ūrdhvasiṃhāsana*), as venerated in all the Āmnāyas and as embodied in (the teachings of) all four of the cardinal thrones, that is to say, as the goddess of the Ūrdhvāmnāya (“Upper Tradition”), transcending them just as the Siddhānta claimed its superiority within the Mantramārga by making its scriptures come forth from the mouth of Īśāna, the upward-gazing, upper face of Sadāśiva, and the Vāmatāntra, Dakṣiṇātantras, Gāruḍatantras, and Bhūtatantras, from the mouths of the faces below that look out to the four directions. And here too, as in the *Jñānārṇava*, it is very clear that the redactor knew only the Paścimāmnāya and Uttarāmnāya as living traditions in the lineage of those outlined in the *Ciñciṇimata*. It gives an accurate account of the cult of Kubjikā and Navātmabhairava for the first and of those of Siddhalakṣmī and Guhyakālī for the second. But for the Pūrvāmnāya and Dakṣiṇāmnāya it gives us two goddesses Pūrṇeśvarī and Niśeśvarī that have

been concocted, it seems, in order to complete the set of four. For these two goddesses appear in the Śaiva tradition only in this text and its Nepalese derivatives such as the *Karmasāramahātāntra*. I know no evidence of scriptural production that would attest that these traditions existed at any time in their own right and I consider it improbable that any will surface, though I do not exclude the possibility that we may encounter in the ill-explored mass of the Newars’ Śākta Paddhatis evidence of the creation of liturgies for their independent worship after their invention in this artificial context. The *Parātāntra* itself suggests their fictive character by reporting that the devotees of these two goddesses dwell on Plakṣadvīpa, Kuśadvīpa, Śākadvīpa, and Puṣkaradvīpa, that is to say, on four of the six concentric island continents that the cosmographers of the Purāṇas claim to lie beyond the salt water ocean that surrounds Jambudvīpa, the central continent centered on Mount Meru, within whose southern segment they located their known world.

The Tantras mentioned here as the two principal scriptural authorities of this neo-Śākta tradition, the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* and the *Yoginīhṛdaya*, came to be considered to be the prior and posterior halves of a single work, the *Vāmakeśvara*, the first devoted to external worship and the second to internal worship or rather to the inner meaning of the ritual, awareness of which was claimed to render the outer ritual effective. But the two works are of very different character. While the first is free of doctrinal or soteriological subtlety, the *Yoginīhṛdaya* was composed by an author who sought to encode the ritual system of Tripurā worship set out in the earlier work with the metaphysics of the Kashmirian Śaiva non-dualists. Therefore it cannot have been written before the 11th century. Indeed the earliest attestations of its existence known to me are a citation of it by Maheśvarānanda (c. 1275–1325) and the commentary on the text by Amṛtānanda (c. 1325–1375), who claims, I propose, that he is the first to have written a commentary on the work and was active in Andhra circa 1350. His predecessor Śivānanda, who flourished around 1225–1275, does not cite the text in his commentary on the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*, and this would be very surprising if the text had already existed in his time. As for the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava*, we can say at present only that it had been existence for an undetermined period before it received a commentary from the Kashmirian Jayaratha, who

flourished under Rājadeva, who ruled from 1213 to 1236, but probably not much earlier than the 11th century.

## Exegetical Literature of the Kulamārga

For exegesis of the Kulamārga of the Pūrvāmṇāya as represented in the literature of the Trika we have the Kashmirian Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka*, in particular its 28th and 29th chapters, and Jayaratha's commentary thereon. For the Anuttara subsystem of the Trika, based on the *Parātriṣṭikā*, also known as the *Parātriṣṭikā* or *Anuttaratrīṣṭikā*, we have Abhinavagupta's *Parātriṣṭikāvivarāṇa*, and the 22nd chapter of his *Tantrasāra* corresponding to the 29th of the *Tantrāloka*, in which he deviates from the latter by taking the *Parātriṣṭikā* rather than the *Mālinīvijayottara* as the basis of his Kaula Paddhati.

We also have a number of texts from South India written within the conceptual framework of the Kashmirian Trika that show that this subsystem became established in that region in later times. This is the probable provenance of the commentary *Parātriṣṭikālaghuvṛtti* or *Anuttaravimarśinī*. That too has been attributed to Abhinavagupta; but the two commentaries, this and Abhinavagupta's much longer and more complex *-vivarāṇa*, are of markedly different intellectual quality and diverge not only in their interpretations but also in their readings. That the *-laghuvṛtti* is a South Indian work is suggested by its manuscript transmission and by the existence of a body of South Indian material based on it, namely a commentary (*-laghuvṛttivimarśinī*) by Kṛṣṇadāsa, the successor of Madhurāja/Mādhurācārya ("The Ācārya of Madurai"), and a verse commentary, the *Parātriṣṭikātātparyadīpikā*, written in Chidambaram and of unknown authorship, and Paddhatis and other ancillary texts that attest to the enduring popularity of a tradition based on this commentary among South Indian Śākta-Śaivas: the *Anuttarasamvidarcanārcā*, the *\*Parārcanakrama*, the *\*Parākramavāsanā* in the *Paramaśivādvaitakalpalatikā* of Śāmbhavānanda, the *Pūrvaparāpūjā*, the *Parāpūjā*, and the *Paraparāpūjā* that are chapters 8, 9, and 11 of the *Ānandakalpavallī* of Maheśvaratejānanda, the *Parāpūjāprayoga*, the *Mahārthamūlasamketasūtra* of Paraśambhudeva, the *Anuttaraprakāśapañcāśikā*, also called *Parā-*

*pañcāśikā*, attributed to Ādyanātha, the *Parāprāveśikā* of Nāgānanda, also known as *Svarūpaprakāśikā*, with a commentary (*Svarūpavimarśinī*) by one Cidānanda, and another (*Nāgānandasūtravivarāṇa*) by Heddase Hariharasārman written for Basavappa Nāyaka of Keladi (Kēlaḍi) in Karnataka (r. 1697–1714), the *Anuttarapaddhati* of the *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra* with the commentary (*Saubhāgyasudhodaya*) of Rāmeśvara (1831), the parallel *Parāpaddhati* of Umānanda's *Nityotsava* (1745), the *Parāmantramāhātmya*, and the *Parāstuti* of Sahajānanda. There is also another probably South Indian commentary (*-vivarāṇa*) on the *Parātriṣṭikā*, written by one by Sadānanda.

This tradition also reached Orissa, since it is the content of the *Parājapavidhi* and *Parāmantravidhi* in the *Āṅgirasakalpa* collection of the Oriya Paippalādin Atharvavedins. As to whether it reached Orissa through the spread of the tradition from the south up through Andhra or by some other route cannot be settled beyond doubt from the evidence now known to me. But the numerous correspondences in details of procedure between these texts and the South Indian Parākrama, not least the use of the visualization verse for the goddess Parā seen in those texts, make the former scenario the most probable. The least probable is transmission from Kashmir, since the part of the *Parātriṣṭikā* incorporated in the Orissan *Parājapavidhi* agrees with the South Indian version of the text rather than the Kashmirian transmitted in Abhinavagupta's *-vivarāṇa*.

For the Uttarāmṇāya, including the Krama, we have no running commentaries on its scriptures, but we do have a rich literature of professed human authorship setting out its ritual and meditational disciplines. That composed by Kashmirians, principally the three texts that share the title *Mahānayaparakāśa* (one anonymous, and the other two by Kulācārya Arṇasimha and Rājānaka Śitikanṭha) and the *Chummāsamketaparakāśa* of Niṣkriyānanda, has been covered by me in some detail in another publication (Sanderson, 2007b). From Chola Nadu (Cōḷanāṭu) in South India we have the *Mahārthamañjarī* in Maharashtri Prakrit with an elaborate Sanskrit autocommentary (*-parimala*) by Maheśvarānanda (c. 1300), and, of unknown provenance, the *Cidgaganacandrikā* of Śrīvatsa. From Nepal we have Vimalaprabodha's *Kālikulakramārcana*, an exhaustive Paddhati of the early 13th century for the Krama worship

of Guhyakālī, and the *Mahārthakramapañcakamantrapaddhati*, which gives the *mantra* text of this same liturgy.

For the cult of the goddess Kubjikā in the Paścimāmnāya we have in Nepalese manuscripts practical commentaries on both the *Kubjikāmata* (-*laghuṭippaṇī*) and the *Ṣaṣṣāhasrakulālikāmnāya* (-*ṭippaṇī*) and at least three detailed Paddhatis by learned scholars: the *Nityāhnikatilaka* of Jaya, son of Śrīkaṇṭha, which reaches us in Nepalese and East Indian manuscripts, the earliest dated in 1268/1269, the *Nityaparakāśa* of Vīracandra, composed in 1072/1073, with the commentary *Nityaparakāśavivaraṇapañjikā*, also called *Nityakaumudī*, written by his chief disciple Gaṅgādhara at the request of the latter's pupil Śambhudatta, the personal physician of the Pala monarch Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126); and the *Śrīmatapaddhati*, also called *Siddhasaṃtānasopānapaṇkti*, of Jasorāja (Yaśorājacandra), of which we have an incomplete copy in a composite Nepalese codex of the 12th century and a copy in an east Indian manuscript dated in year 144 of the era of Lakṣmana(sena), that is to say, in 1263 or 1252.

From the Dakṣiṇāmnāya as defined by the *Ciñciṇīmata*, that is to say, from the cult of Kāmeśvarī attended by Kāmadeva and the 11 Nityās, no exegetical work has come to light. But from the Kaula cult of Tripurasundarī that developed from it have such an abundance of postscriptural sources that only the most influential will be mentioned. We have commentaries on the *Nityāśoḍaśikārṇava* by the South Indians Śivānanda (c. 1225–1275; -*rjuvimarśinī*), Vidyānanda (-*artharatnāvalī*), probably his near contemporary, and by the Kashmirian Rājānaka Jayaratha (c. 1250; *Vāmakeśvarīmatavivaraṇa*), a commentary on the *Yoginīhṛdaya* by the South Indian Amṛtānanda (c. 1325–1375), and a commentary (-*setubandha*) on both Tantras, presented as the prior and posterior divisions of a single work, the *Vāmakeśvara*, by the Maharashtrian Deśastha Brahman Bhāskaraṛāya (1690–1785). From Nāgabhaṭṭa we have the Paddhati *Tripurāsārasamuccaya*, from Śivānanda, who cites Nāgabhaṭṭa, two Paddhatis, *Subhagodaya* and *Subhagodayavāsana*, one covering the ritual procedures and the other giving their inner meanings (*vāsana*), the contemplation of which is held to animate the external actions. We also have a liturgical hymn of his: the *Saubhāgyahṛdayastotra*. From a Vidyānandanātha, who is probably identical with the Vidyānanda who wrote the (-*artharatnāvalī*),

we have the Paddhati *Jñānadīpavimarśinī* of which we have a Nepalese manuscript dated in 1382/1383, and from Amṛtānanda the Paddhati *Saubhāgyasudhodaya* and a liturgical hymn, the *Cidvilāsa*. From his Guru Puṇyānanda we have the *Kāmakalāvilāsa*, with a commentary (-*cidvallī*) by Naṭanānanda.

We also have texts from the Śaḍanvayaśāmbhava system of worship, a secondary variant of the Paścimāmnāya, not mentioned by the *Ciñciṇīmata*, that flourished in conjunction with the cult of Tripurasundarī. We have its scripture *Śambhunirṇaya* and by way of exegesis a commentary (-*dīpikā*) on that text by Śivānanda, the author of the -*rjuvimarśinī* commentary on the *Nityāśoḍaśikārṇava*. We also have for this system chapter 10 of the *Ānandakalpavallī* of Maheśvaratejānanda, the *Śaḍanvayaśāmbhavadakrama* of Umākānta, a disciple of Amṛtānanda, and the anonymous Paddhati *Śāmbhavadpūjāvidhāna*.

## Salvific Alchemy and Procedures for Victory in Battle

Two further categories of Śaiva tantric literature may be mentioned. One, the *rasaśāstra* (→ *rasāyana*), teaches an initiatory tantric alchemical cult for the attainment of immortality and liberation through the use of mercurial elixirs, and is found in such Tantras as the *Rasārṇava*, the *Ānandakanda*, and the *Rasasvacchanda*, and such scripture-based works as the *Rasaratnasamuccaya* of Vāgbhaṭa. The other teaches rituals and prognosticatory procedures to secure victory in battle. Its fundamental scripture is the *Yuddhajayārṇava*, which reaches us in a manuscript of 1061. Based on this source we have Narapati's *Narapatijayacaryāśvarodaya*, completed in Aṇahillapattana (Patan), the capital of the Caulukyas in northern Gujarat, during the reign of Ajayapāla (1173/1174–1176/1177), and the anonymous *Samgrāmaṇijayodaya*, which claims to have been extracted from the *Yuddhajayārṇava* as its essence. Material from this tradition also found its way into the *Agnipurāṇa* as its chapters 123 to 150.

This martial tradition might have been mentioned above in the company of the Bhūtantrās and Gāruḍatantrās, since like those traditions it is ancillary to the main Śaiva systems, and indeed is covered with them in the Keralan works *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* and

*Tantrasārasaṃgraha*. It has been placed here, as has the tradition of tantric alchemy, because the cultic background on which both draw is that of the Kulamārga. Thus in the *Rasārṇava* and *Rasaratnasamuccaya* Kaula practice is rejected but Kaula terminology is frequently used and the pantheon draws on the Kaula cults. The iconography of Rasabhairava and Rasāṅkuṣā, the central syzygy, reveal them to be ectypes of Svacchanda-bhairava and Tripurasundarī, and their innermost circuit of attendant deities comprises Mālinī, Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā, the core triad of the Trika with Mālinī as the transcendent fourth. Also present is the *mantra* of the Paścimāmnāya's goddess Kubjikā. The *Yuddhajayārṇava* too requires the worship of Kaula deities.

## Pratyabhijñā and Spandapratyabhijña

The South Indian authors Śivānanda, Vidyānanda (either one or two), Puṇyānanda, Naṭanānanda, Amṛtānanda, Nāgānanda, Maheśvaratejānanda, Maheśvarānanda, Paraśambhudeva, Śāmbhavānanda, and Sahajānanda, all wrote within the philosophical and soteriological position formulated by Kashmirian Śākta-Śaiva scholars during the course of the 10th and into the early years of the 11th century. That development began with the *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*, of Somānanda (fl. c. 900–950 CE) and was refined by his pupil Utpaladeva in his commentary on that work, and in four independent treatises, namely the *Siddhitrayī* (*Īśvarasiddhi*, *Saṃbandhasiddhi*, and *Ajaḍapramāṭṛsiddhi*), and the *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā*. On the last of these he composed two commentaries: the *Vṛtti*, which survives, and the *Vivṛti*, of which we have only a few fragments. Abhinavagupta, pupil of Utpaladeva's pupil Lakṣmaṇagupta, composed his commentary *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* on the *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* and his *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivismarśinī* on the second of Utpaladeva's autocommentaries. From Abhinavagupta's pupil Kṣemarāja we have the *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya*, in which he relates the doctrine of this philosophical corpus to the nondualistic practice of his Kaula tradition, drawing primarily on the Krama, which for him is the summit of the Śaiva revelation. On the *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* we also have a commentary (*Pratyabhijñākaumudī*) by a Bhaṭṭāraka

Sundara, a Kashmirian devotee of Tripurasundarī, and another by a certain Sadānanda (*Īśvarapratyabhijñātātparyānvayadīpikā*), probably a South Indian. On the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* we have two commentaries, one, the *Bhāskari*, written by the Kashmirian Bhāskarakaṇṭha towards the end of the 17th century, and the other, an anonymous *-vyākhyā*. The manuscript of the latter does not reveal the author's identity. But he is evidently a South Indian, since the sources that he quotes closely match those of other works of this tradition in the Tamilian region, such as the *Paramaśivādvaitakalpalatikā* of Śāmbhavānanda and the *Mahārthamañjarīparimāla* of Maheśvarānanda; and he quotes South Indian works not known outside that region until recent times, such as the *Paryantapañcāśikā*, the *Parātrimśikālaghuvṛtti*, and an unnamed work by Vāḍipralayabhairava, who is no doubt the Vāḍibhairava mentioned as a propagator of the Pratyabhijñā doctrine and as one of the teachers of Mādhurāja/Mādhurācārya in the opening verses of two other works of the Tamil country: the *Ānandakalpavallī* of Maheśvaratejānanda and the *Gurupañktistotra*. Since the author of the *-vyākhyā* quotes the *Mahārthamañjarī*, he cannot have been active before the 14th century.

Also influential on those assimilating the Kashmirian Śaiva nondualism and its terminology were the *Śivasūtra*, the *Spandakārikā*, and their commentaries by Kṣemarāja and others, these texts like the Pratyabhijñā corpus representing an attempt to establish a doctrine that transcends the liturgical and devotionalspecifics of such systems as the Trika and the Krama. Among the texts of this corpus is a work by a South Indian: the *Śivasūtravṛttika* of Varadarāja, also called Kṛṣṇadāsa, which is a paraphrase in verse of Kṣemarāja's prose commentary (*-vimarśinī*) on the *Śivasūtra*.

These doctrines of the Pratyabhijñā and Spanda texts could then be applied, and were applied, to the exegesis of other tantric traditions in Kashmir and beyond, notably the cults of Svacchanda and Amṛteśvara, the Trika, the Krama, the cult of Tripurasundarī, the Śaḍanvayaśāmbhava variant of the Paścimāmnāya, the Viraśaivism of the *Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi* of Śivayogin, also called Reṇukācārya, and its commentary *Tattvapradīpikā* by Maritōṇṭadārya, and even beyond Śaivism, in the South Indian Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇava system seen in the *Lakṣmitantra* and *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā*.



## Non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva Hymnography

Also instrumental in propagating the new Śākta-Śaiva nondualism of the Kashmirians among non-Saiddhāntika Śaivas of all liturgical persuasions was a literature of devotional hymns (*stotra*, *stuti*, *stava*) supported by learned commentaries. Notable are the *Bahurūpagarbhastotra* with the commentary of Anantaśakti, the hymn collections *Stavacintāmaṇi* of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa and *Śivastotrāvalī* of Utpaladeva, on both of which we have commentaries by Kṣemarāja, the *Sāmbapañcāśikā* with a commentary by the same, and the *Virūpākṣapañcāśikā* with commentaries by Vidyācakraṇvartin and Heddase Hariharaśarman.

## Later Developments

The map of Śaiva literature outlined here holds for the period up to about the 12th century, though many of its elements continued, as we have seen, to produce texts long after that. But it should not be thought that the 12th century marked the end of the Śaivas' capacity for innovation.

In the *Padyāvahinī* of Śaṅkara, a South Indian work probably of the first half of the 14th century, we encounter a novel form of syncretistic Śākta devotion in which the cult of Tripurasundarī, the Anuttara's cult of Parā, the Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhava variant of the cult of Kubjikā, and the pantheon of the Krama system, that is to say, the elements that as distinct systems constitute the Śākta domain known to Śivānanda and Maheśvarānanda, are woven together into a single course of regular and occasional worship.

We have evidence of another such syncretistic development in South India in the literature of a cult of the goddess Lalitā/Kāmākṣī of Kanchipuram. Here she is worshipped as Tripurasundarī with ancillary cults of Gaṇapati and the goddesses Mātāṅgī (Śyāmalā), Vārāhī (Daṇḍinī), and Parā, the last adopted from of the Anuttara form of the Trika. This was prescribed in the *Paraśurāmakaḥpāsūtra*, which pious tradition holds to be the last and shortest of a series of abridgements of an original *Dattasamhitā* of 18,000 verses. We have a Paddhati, the *Nityotsava*, composed in 1745 by the Maharashtrian Deśastha Brahman Jagannātha (initiated as Umānandanātha), a disciple of Bhāskaraṛāya,

who enjoyed the patronage of the Marathas of the Bhonsle dynasty then ruling from Thanjavur, an extensive commentary (*Saubhāgyasudhodaya*) composed in 1831 by the Maharashtrian Deśastha Brahman Rāmeśvara (initiated as Aparājitaṇandanātha), disciple of a disciple of a disciple of Bhāskaraṛāya, and another by the Maharashtrian Koṅkaṇastha Brahman Lakṣmaṇa Rāṇade (*Sūtratattvavimarśinī*), completed in 1889. There was also a commentary (*Ratnāloka*) by the Deśastha Brahman Bhāskaraṛāya (initiated as Bhāsurānandanātha), the *guru* of Jagannātha. But I do not know of any surviving manuscript of this work.

The system was provided with less ambiguously scriptural status in the *Paramānandatantra* and the *Tripurārahasya* with the minor difference that these works have replaced the Anuttara's goddess Parā with the cognate Bālā form of Tripurasundarī. The former work has reached us with a commentary (*Saubhāgyānandasamdoha*) by Maheśvarānandanātha, a resident of Banaras, written in 1828/1829, and the latter with a commentary written in 1832 by Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa of Madurai in the far south. Also in this tradition, with Bālā in place of Parā, are the 18th-century Paddhati *Saubhāgyakalpadruma* of the Dravidian Brahman Lakṣmaṇa (initiated as Mādhavānandanātha) and, following it, the *Mahāyāgapaddhati* of the Dravidian Brahman Lakṣmīnātha (initiated as Ambikānandanātha) written at the request of Maharaja Sawai Raja Singh II of Jaipur (b. 1833; r. 1835–1880). All the literature of this cult is steeped in the tradition of the Kashmirian Śākta-Śaiva nondualists, and the commentaries frequently cite their works. How long before its 18th- and 19th-century exegesis this syncretistic variant of the cult of Tripurasundarī came into existence is uncertain. But it is probably this or a cult very close to it that is referred to in the 16th century in a verse that another Śrīnivāsabhaṭṭa, known also as Ratnakheṭa, has a Śākta named Śaktisiddhānta recite in his allegorical drama *Bhāvanāpuruṣottama*, invoking Bālā, Mātāṅgī (Mātāṅgakanyā), and Vārāhī.

Another influential development that is probably to be assigned to a date after the 12th century is seen in the *Kulārṇava*. This expounds a new form of Kaulism that it refers to as the Ūrdhvāmnāya ("Upper Tradition"), thereby claiming, like the cult of Tripurasundarī, superiority over the forms of Śākta-Śaivism that preceded it. This has little in common with the elaborate pantheons and

*mantra* systems of the forms of the Kulamārga reviewed up to this point. For it teaches a radically simplified cult of Ardhanārīśvara with an icon that is a variant of the Trika's Parā (KuT. 4.112c–113b) but, as its name declares, is half Śiva and half the Goddess. This fusion is also expressed in the system's *mantras*. For these are the *prāsādaparā* (*hsauṃḥ*) and the *parāprāsāda* (*shaumḥ*), which are the result of fusing the *mantra* of Parā (*sauḥ*), the high goddess of the Trika, with the *prāsāda* (*haumḥ*), the *mantra* of Śiva in the Saiddhāntika system on which most of the Saiddhāntika Paddhatis are based. However, apart from the *mantra* there is no discernible connection with the Trika and certainly no trace of awareness of the distinctive doctrines of the Kashmirian nondualistic exegesis of that tradition that permeated the South Indian exegesis of the cult of Tripurasundarī and related systems down to recent times. The latest stratum of the South Indian Śākta literature takes it into account by including it in a classification of the *mantra* pantheon into six Āmnāyas. In this the *Kulārṇava* tradition is accommodated in the Ūrdhvāmnāya division with a yet higher division, the Anuttarāmnāya ("Ultimate Tradition"), ranked above it and populated with *mantras* that include those proper to the worship of Tripurasundarī.

It was also during this period that there emerged out of the Kulamārga the tradition later known as the → Nāth Sampradāya, comprising lineages of Śākta-Śaiva "Kāpālikas" claiming spiritual descent from Gorakṣanātha (Gorakhnāth), whom they venerate as a disciple of Matsyendranātha, the Macchandanātha of the Pūrvāmnāya, the propagator of the Kulamārga during the present *kaliyuga*. The literature of this vigorous tradition, which appears to have had its origin in the Deccan, contains works such as the *Matsyendrasaṃhitā*, probably a South Indian work of the 13th century – this is also the date of the earliest references to Gorakṣanātha – which combines Kaula materials pertaining to the cults of Tripurasundarī and Kubjikā (particularly in its Ṣaḍanvayaśāmbhāva variant), and many works teaching a system of *yoga* that use Kaula terminology and concepts but tend to reject Kaula externals, such as the *Vivekamārtanḍa*, the *Gorakṣasāṭaka*, the *Amaraughaprabodha*, *Amaraughasāsana*, and the *Khecarividya*.

Related to this meta-Kaula Yoga literature are the *Amṛtasiddhi*, the *Amanaska*, the *Dattātreya yogaśāstra*, the *Śivasamhitā*, and

works found variously grouped together in Kashmirian manuscripts alongside the *Gorakṣasāṭaka* and *Amaraughasāsana*, namely the *Candrajñāna*, *Jñānasāra*, *Niruttaravāda*, *Nirvāṇayogottara*, *Paramārthasāra*, *Prāṇāgnihoṭra*, *Brahmasaṃdhāna*, *Matsyodarayogaśāstra*, *Sarvajñānottarayogaśāstra*, and *Haṃsasāra*.

In eastern India after the decline of Buddhism in that region, various goddesses not encountered in earlier Kaula/Śākta sources, namely Śyāmā (Dakṣiṇā, Dakṣiṇā Kālī, Dakṣiṇakālī), Tārā, Chinnamastā, Dhūmāvati, Bagalā or Bagalāmukhī, and Bhuvaneśvarī, made their appearance in a new wave of Kaula scriptural literature, eventually forming with Tripurasundarī (Ṣoḍaśī, Śrīvidyā), Mātāṅgī, Kamalā, and Tripurabhairavī the ten *mahāvidyās*, with three of these the primary focus of devotion: Tripurasundarī, Tārā, and Dakṣiṇā Kālī. Notable Tantras of this East Indian Śākta tradition are the *Kaṅkālamālīnī*, *Kāmadhenu*, *Kālivilāsa*, *Kubjikā*, *Kumārī*, *Kulacūḍāmaṇi*, *Kaulāvalīnirṇaya*, *Guptasādhana*, *Jñānasamkalīnī*, *Toḍala*, *Nigamakalpadruma*, *Nigamatattvasāra*, *Niruttara*, *Nirvāṇa*, *Picchilā*, *Phetkārīnī*, *Brhadyoni*, *Brhannīla*, *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*, *Muṇḍamālā*, *Yoginī*, *Yoni*, *Rādhā*, *Varadā*, *Vīra*, *Samayācāra*, and *Samṃmohana*; a major early compendium drawing on many of these texts and thereby providing those with a *terminus ante quem* is the *Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvānandanātha, probably compiled circa 1400; and important later scriptural sources are the *Śaktisaṃgamatantra*, probably of the 17th century, and the *Merutantra*, a work composed or at least completed in its present form after the arrival of the British in India. Notable among numerous later compendia and Paddhatis in this tradition are the 16th-century Bengali Brahmanāndagiri's *Śāktānandatarāṅgiṇī* and *Tārārahasya*, the former a general Śākta treatise and the latter on the worship of Tārā, his disciple Pūrṇānanda's *Śyāmārahasya* on the worship of Dakṣiṇā Kālī and *Śrītattvacintāmaṇi* on that of Tripurasundarī, the latter completed in 1577, the *Mantramahodadhi* of Mahīdhara, a Brahman of Ahicchatra residing in Banaras, completed in 1588, the *Tantrasāra* of the Bengali Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgiśa, written in the 16th or 17th century, the *Śyāmārcanacandrikā* and *Kramacandrikā* of the Bengali Ratnagarbha Sārvabhauma, *guru* of Kedār Rāy, the *zamindār* of Bikrampur near Dhaka killed in 1603, the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava* of the Maithila Narasiṃha Ṭhakkura completed in 1668, the *Āgamatattvavilāsa* of the

Bengali Raghunātha Tarkavāgīśa (1687), the *Puraścaryārṇava* of Mahārāja Pratāp Singh Shāh of Nepal (r. 1774–1777), the 18th-century *Kālikārcanacandrikā* of the Bengali Keśava Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, the *Tārābhaktitarāṅgiṇī* of the Bengali Kāśinātha (1815), the *Prāṇatoṣiṇī* of the Bengali Prāṇatoṣaṇa Vidyālaṅkāra (1821), the *Dikṣāprakāśa* of the Maithila Jīvanātha (1869/1870), and the *Śāktapramoda* (1889) of Rāja Devanandan Singh, a *zamīndār* of Muzaffarpur in Bihar.

From late medieval Kashmir we have the syncretistic, Tripurā-centered Śākta tradition of the *Devīrahasya*, also called *Parārahasya*, which adapts this east Indian tradition in various ways, also working in Śārikā, Śāradā, Rājñī, and Jvālāmukhī, the lineage goddesses (*kuladevī*) of the Kashmirian Brahmins. From Sāhib Kaul, the 17th-century Śākta scholar of the Kashmirian Kaul lineage that originated in northern Bihar, we have detailed Paddhatis for the regular worship of three deities of this tradition: a *Śyāmāpaddhati* for Dakṣiṇā Kālī, a *Hṛllekhāpaddhati* for Bhuvaneśvarī, and a *Śrīvidyānityapūjāpaddhati* for Tripurasundarī.

Probably from Mithilā, we have the tradition of the *Mahākālasaṃhitā*, which, in the context of the east Indian Śākta tradition of the *mahāvidyās*, teaches at great length the cults of two Kālīs, Kāmakālākālī and Guhyakālī in an expurgated form in which only Śūdras are allowed to offer and consume alcoholic liquor and meat in the worship of the Goddess, the twice-born being required to employ various tame substitutes. All the works of this east Indian neo-Śākta tradition lack the doctrinal underpinning provided by the earlier Śaiva and Śākta-Śaiva traditions reviewed here, reverting to a Smārta ontology based on the 25 *tattvas* of the → Sāṃkhya system, in which the Goddess (Śakti) is equated with → *prakṛti* and Śiva with → *puruṣa*.

Also to be mentioned as major developments of this period are the expurgated and internalized cult that called itself the Samayamata, expounded by Lakṣmīdhara, a courtier of Pratāparudra, the Gajapati ruler of Orissa, in the first decades of the 16th century, in his commentary on the Śākta hymn *Saundaryalaharī*, for those who wished to remain within the bounds of Brahmanical orthopraxy and orthodoxy, the eclectic, Smārta tantric tradition, probably originating in Orissa in the 12th century, of the *Prapañcasāra* and *Śāradātilaka*, and, following the latter, such

texts as the *Śaivacintāmaṇi* of Lakṣmīdharamiśra, a late-17th-century Vaidiki Brahman of Bhubaneswar under Gajapati Mukundadeva I. The *Śāradātilaka* reaches us in many manuscripts from all over the subcontinent, along with an exhaustive citation-rich commentary composed in Banaras in 1494 by Rāghavabhāṭṭa, a Deśastha brahmin whose father had migrated from Nasik to Banaras. Both the Samayamata and this tradition of the *Prapañcasāra* and *Śāradātilaka* have aligned themselves with Brahmanical orthodoxy by jettisoning the 36 *tattva* hierarchy of the classical Śaiva systems for that of the Sāṃkhya.

Nor was creativity after the 12th century limited to the Śākta side of Śaivism. The period from the close of the 12th century saw the emergence in the Deccan of the movement of the non-Brahman Vīraśaivas, also called → Liṅgāyats, who are now the largest community in Karnataka, forming about 15 percent of the population overall and up to a third in some areas. This produced its own literature in Kannara, Sanskrit, and, to a lesser extent, in Telugu and Marathi, from the 12th century down to modern times. The Kannara sources comprise collections of devotional poetic prose (*vacanas*) written in simple language by the saints (*śaraṇas*) of this tradition, namely Allamaṇḍaprabhu (Prabhuliṅga), → Basava, Cennabasava, Siddharāmayya, and numerous others, including women, such as → Akkāmāhadevī, and hagiographical works such as the 12th-century *Śivagaṇadararagaḷe* of Harihara, the *Somanāthacaritre* and *Siddharāmapurāṇa* of Harihara's disciple Rāghavaṅka, the *Basavapurāṇa* of Bhīmakavi (1369), which is a Kannara translation of the 13th-century Telugu *Basavapurāṇamu* of Pāṅkuriki Somanātha, the *Prabhuliṅgalīle* of Cāmarasa (1430), the *Vīraśaivāmṛtapurāṇa* of Mallanārya (c. 1513), and the *Cennabasavapurāṇa* of Virūpākṣa (1584), the *Śivatattvacintāmaṇi* of Lakkaṇa Daṇḍeśa (1441), general and minister of Devarāya II of Vijayanagara, and the four versions of the *Śūnyasaṃpādane*, by Śivagaṇaprasādi Mahādēvayya (c. 1420), Keṇḍaviraṇṇodeyaru or his *guru* Halageya Dēvaru (c. 1495), Gummaḷapurada Siddhaliṅgadēvaru (c. 1500), and Guḷūra Siddhaviṇāryaru (c. 1510), in which the *vacanas* of the saints are embedded in a narrative framework arranged to portray the stages of spiritual progress.

In Telugu notable Vīraśaiva works other than the 13th-century *Basavapurāṇamu* of Pāṅkuriki Somanātha mentioned above, are the same

author's *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu*, *Anubhava-sāramu*, *Caturvedasāramu*, and *Vṛṣādhipaśatakamu*, the *Śivatattvasāramu* of Paṇḍitārādhyā, the *Haravilāsamu*, *Bhīmeśvarapurāṇamu*, also called *Bhīmakhaṇḍamu*, *Śivarātrimāhātmyamu*, *Kāśī-khaṇḍamu*, and *Paṇḍitārādhyacaritramu* of Śrīnātha (1365–1440), and the *Kālahastīśvaramāhātmyamu* and *Kālahastīśvaraśatakamu* of Dhūrjaṭi in the early 16th century.

Notable among Vīraśaiva works in Marathi are the 16th-century Śāntaliṅga's *Karṇahastaki*, *Vivekacintāmaṇi*, and *Śāntabodha*, and the *Paramarahasya*, *Jñānabodha*, *Anubhavānanda*, and other works of Manmatha (1560–1613).

The Sanskrit sources, which dominate in the areas of ritual and theological doctrine, comprise scriptural works such as the *Kāraṇa*, *Candrajñāna*, *Makuta*, *Pārameśvara*, *Vātulaśuddha*, and *Vīra* (*Vīrottara*) – these have the names of early Saiddhāntika scriptures in spite of their Vīraśaiva content, which is for the most part the detailed prescription of the rituals of daily worship and initiation – the doctrinal *Anubhavasūtra* of Māyideva, which claims to transmit the teaching of the scripture *Vātulottara*, and exegetical works such as the *Kriyāsāra* composed by Nilakaṇṭhaśivācārya at some time between circa 1350 and 1530, when, he says, Śiva himself had appeared to him in a dream and commanded him to produce a summary of all the Śaiva scriptures, the *Siddhāntaśikhamaṇi* of Śivayogin, probably of the 13th or early 14th century, together with its 17th-century commentary by Maritōṇṭadārya, both following in their metaphysics the non-dualistic doctrine of the Kashmirian Śākta-Śaivas, Śrīpati's *Śrīkarabhāṣya*, a Vīraśaiva commentary (c. 1400) on the Brahmanical *Brahmasūtra*, the *Śivayogapradīpikā* of Cennasādāśivayogin (15th cent.), the 17th-century *Līṅgadhāraṇa-candrikā* of Nandikeśvara, the *Pañcaratna* of Vīraṇārādhyā and its commentary by Sosale Revaṇārādhyā (c. 1650), the latter's *Pramathagaṇapaddhati*, the *Anādivīraśaivācārasaṃgraha* of Sampādanasiddha Vīraṇāśivayogin (c. 1600), the Paddhati-like *Vīraśaivācārasāroddhārabhāṣya* of Somanātha, the *Vīramāheśvarācārasaṃgraha* of Nilakaṇṭhagaṇanātha, the *Vīraśaiva-siddhāntottarakauṃudī* of Virabhadrārādhyā, and the *Vivekacintāmaṇi* of Līṅgarāja. This later literature is heavily dependent on the doctrinal sources of the Saiddhāntikas, both their scriptures and such exegetical or secondary works as the *Tattvapraśāsa*, the *Siddhāntaśekhara*, and the

*Siddhāntasārāvalī*, but it also looks for support to the *Śivadharma*, the Śaiva Purāṇas, the Upaniṣads, and works on *yoga* such as the *Yogabīja* and the *Yogatārāvalī*.

The period after the 12th century also saw significant innovations among the Śaivas of the Tamil-speaking region. Here too we find a body of devotional poetry in the vernacular, but one whose earliest and most venerated collections predate that of the Vīraśaivas by several centuries. By the 11th century a closed canon of devotional literature in Tamil had been established. Arranged in 12 books, known as the *Tirumurai* (Sacred Treatises), it comprises primarily collections of Tamil hymns attributed to a number of poet-saints, expressing devotion (*bhakti*) to Śiva as manifest to these devotees in numerous sacred sites throughout the region. Books 1–3 contain the poems of Campantar (Tirunāṇacampantamūrtti), books 4–6 those of Appar (Tirunāvukaracar), book 7 those of Cuntarar (Cuntaramūrtti) – the hymns of these three poets are known collectively as the *Tēvāram* – book 8 those of Māṇikkavācakar, and books 9 and 11 those of 21 other devotees, among them Nampi Āṇṭār Nampi and the poetess Kāraikkālammaiṃ. To these collections were added the soteriological treatise *Tirumantiram* of Tirumūlar as book 10 and the *Periyapurāṇam* of Cēkkilār as book 12. The last, composed during the reign of the Chola Kulottuṅga II (r. 1133–1150), is a hagiographical narrative of the lives of these and other Tamil Śaiva saints, the 63 → Nāyaṇārs ("Lords"), of whom, according to this account, less than a fifth were Brahmans and three were women.

It is widely held that Appar and Campantar lived in the 7th century, Cuntarar and Māṇikkavācakar in the 9th, and, even earlier than these, Kāraikkālammaiṃ in the 6th. It is at least clear that Cuntarar, who refers with reverence to both Campantar and Appar, was living before 913 CE, the last year of Pallava rule, since he refers to Śiva as punishing rulers who refuse to pay tribute to these kings. The *Tirumantiram* has been assigned various early dates, but its contents render a date long before the closure of this canon in the 12th century very unlikely.

After this corpus of sacred texts had been constituted there developed a body of neo-Saiddhāntika theological writing in Tamil, eventually forming a canon of 14 texts known as the Śāstras of Meykaṇṭar (*meykaṇṭacāttiraṇkaḷ*). The first two works, the *Tiruvuntīyār* of Tiruviyalūr



Uyyavantatēvanāyaṇār, and its expansion, the *Tirukkaḷirruppaṭiyār* of Tirukkatavūr Uyyavanta-tēvanāyaṇār, are transitional between the devotional poetry of the *Tirumurai* and the 12 theological treatises that followed. These are the *Civañānapōtam* of Meykaṇṭār, the *Civañānacittiyār* of Aruṇanti, a treatise elaborating the new doctrine, which attracted a number of Tamil commentaries, his *Irupāvirupahtu*, the *Uṇmaivilakkam* of Maṇa-vācakaṇkaṇṭantār, and eight works by Umāpaticiva: the *Civappirakācam*, *Tiruvartupayan*, the *Viñāvenpā*, the *Pōrippaḥṟōtai*, the *Koṭikkavi*, the *Neñcuviṭutūtu*, the *Uṇmainerivilakkamtukaḷarupōtam*, and the *Caṅkarpanirākaraṇam*. Dates have been assigned to all 14 texts, beginning with 1147 for the *Tiruvuntiyār* and 1177 for the *Tirukkaḷirruppaṭiyār*. But the authority for the dates assigned to the first 13 works is obscure. Only the last, the *Caṅkarpanirākaraṇam*, is securely dated, in 1313.

This Tamil corpus and its exegesis were complemented in the 16th century by Sanskrit works along the same lines, notably the *Pauṣkarabhāṣya* of another Umāpatiśiva on the *Pauṣkarajñānapāda*, the latter claiming to be the doctrinal section of the *Pauṣkarapārameśvara*, one of the early Saiddhāntika scriptures, the *Śaivaparibhāṣā* of Śivāgrayogīndra Jñānaśivācārya, the same author's *Samgrahabhāṣya* and *Vistarabhāṣya* on the *Śivajñānabodha*, and, of uncertain date, the *Devikālottara*, a short text claiming scriptural status as a redaction of the *Kālottara*, though of very different content and spirit from the early *Kālottara* versions, which are genuine redactions of a single work, probably the *Sārdhatrisatika*.

This new tradition in Tamil and Sanskrit propagated a rapprochement with the language of vedantic nondualism. It was not nondualistic in the sense of the Advaita Vedānta or the Pratyabhijñā. For it continued to adhere to the doctrine of the plurality of souls and the reality of the material universe. However it rephrased the Saiddhāntika definition of Śiva's causality in a manner that enabled it to appear to escape the criticism of Śaivism enshrined in the *Brahmasūtra* (2.2.35; *patyur asāmañjasyāt*), namely that it claims that Śiva is only the efficient cause of the universe (*nimittakāraṇa*) and not also its material cause (*upādānakāraṇa*). We are now told that Śiva is both causes, being the former per se and the latter through association with the two → *māyās* that provide the matter of the pure and impure universes. It also shifted the emphasis from rites to devotion and liberating knowledge,

claiming that the latter alone can complete the soul's liberation, and this gnostic reorientation is already apparent in what is said to be the earliest of the *meykaṇṭacāttiraṇkaḷ*, the *Tiruvuntiyār*. There is another respect in which the neo-Siddhānta comes closer to Smārta doctrine. For it has redefined liberation not as the manifestation (*abhivyakti*) of the soul's equality with Śiva (*śivasāmya*), the doctrine of the Kashmirian Saiddhāntikas and their South Indian followers, but as the direct experience of the bliss of Śiva through oneness with him. Further it stressed the neo-Siddhānta's congruence with Brahmanical orthopraxy, and accordingly condemned as delusive the Atimārga and the non-Saiddhāntika forms of the Mantramārga. In all these ways it sought to draw itself closer to the dominant Smārta Śaiva tradition of the region. It also reached out to the uninitiated majority by shifting the emphasis from the Siddhānta's tantric *mantras*, accessible only to initiates, to the universal Śaiva *mantra* advocated for lay devotees in the Śivadharmā corpus and the Śaiva Purāṇas, namely the *pañcākṣara* (five-syllable) *namaḥ śivāya*, a feature that the neo-Siddhānta shares with the Viraśaiva movement.

It was no doubt in the same spirit that in the 16th century Vedajñāna I translated the *Śivadharmottara* and Śivayogīndra Jñānaśivācārya the *Devikālottara* and *Sarvajñānottara* into Tamil, and that Tamil was used for many of the Sthalapurāṇas, texts in praise of particular sacred sites, that were composed during this period, such as the *Kōyirpurāṇam* of Umāpaticiva glorifying Chidambaram, the *Kamalālayaccirappu* and *Aruṇakiripurāṇam* of Vedajñāna I in praise of Thiruvārur and Thiruvannamalai, the *Tiruvaiyyārruppurāṇam* of Nānakūttār, and the numerous such works produced by Ellappa Nāvalar in the 17th century. We may note also that Vedajñāna I produced the *Caivasamayaneṇi* and other works in Tamil on aspects of Śaiva observance, thus ending the monopoly of Sanskrit in this domain too.

During the same centuries the Sanskrit Saiddhāntika literature of the Tamil zone expanded greatly through the creation, redaction, or compilation of numerous scriptures such as the *Aṃsumat*, *Ajita*, *Kāmika*, *Kāraṇa*, *Candrajñāna*, *Cintyaviśvasādākhyā*, *Dīpta*, *Makuṭa*, *Yogaja*, *Raurava*, *Vijaya/Vijayottara*, *Vira*, *Śarvottara*, *Samtāna*, *Sāhasra*, *Siddha*, *Suprabhedha*, and *Sūkṣma*. These too, like the Sanskrit scriptures of the Viraśaivas, have titles contained in the old lists

of the Tantras of the Siddhānta found in our early sources; but they too are unlikely to be, or are certainly not, works of that period. There is no trace of them in the North Indian and Nepalese manuscript collections and where an early work under one of these titles has been cited or excerpted in the early exegetical literature, as is the case with the *Kāmika*, *Makuṭa*, and *Sāhasra*, the text passages so preserved do not establish identity with the works assigned the same titles in late southern sources. Moreover, the manifest purpose of much of this material is to provide scriptural authority for the specifics of the tradition of Śaiva temple worship that had developed in that region under the Tamil Ādiśaiva priesthood, whose hereditary and exclusive right to officiate in the temples of Śiva is much stressed in this literature.

Nonetheless, one should not conclude that the traditions reflected in these materials are entirely South Indian. For instance, the *Kāmika*, probably among the earliest of these neo-Saiddhāntika Tantras, is aware also of an east Indian context, ruling in its coverage of temple worship that devotional songs should be sung either in the Gauda language or the Drāviḍa, that is to say, in the vernacular of Bengal or Tamil. This prescription may be understood in the context of textual and epigraphic evidence that east Indian (*gauḍadeśīya*) Saiddhāntikas were involved in the propagation of the Saiddhāntika tradition in Tamil Nadu, a phenomenon of which we have seen an example above in the ascetic Brahmasīva who carried the Saiddhāntika tradition of the Golagī Maṭha in central India south to Thiruvārur.

The corpus of Śaiva literature from the Tamil-speaking region also includes works that accommodate a more Śākta perspective. This trend, which may be correlated with the widespread construction throughout the region from the 12th century onwards of separate temples known as *kāmakōṭṭam* for Śiva's consort in Śaiva temple complexes, a phenomenon that has been thought to be a consequence of the growing influence of the non-Brahman, Vēḷāḷa agriculturalist castes as patrons of religion during this period, appears in one of the Tamil *Tirumurai*, namely the *Tirumantiram* of Tirumūlar, and also in such Sanskrit works as the *Jñānasiddhyāgama* and the *Siddhāntapaddhati* of a certain Jñānaśivācārya, all showing a similar admixture of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, Śāktism, and Vedānta. A Śaiva-Śākta-Vaidika fusion is also enacted in the system of worship followed in the Chidambaram

temple by its Dīkṣita (non-Ādiśaiva) priesthood seen in their Paddhatis for regular and festival worship, namely the *Cidambareśvaranīyapūjāsūtra* and *Citsabheśotsavasūtra* of the *Cidambaraḥṣetrasarvasva*.

The desire of certain South Indian Śaivas to increase their acceptability in the eyes of the Smārtas may also account for the *Śrīkaṇṭhabhāṣya*, a Śaiva commentary on the *Brahmasūtra* composed by Nilakaṇṭha, also called Śrīkaṇṭha. For this work goes beyond the stance of the Tamil neo-Saiddhāntikas to expound a vedantic Śaiva nondualism in which Śiva qualified by his power of consciousness (*cicchaktiviśiṣṭaśivādvaita*) is said, in keeping with vedantic orthodoxy, to be both the efficient and the material cause of the world, drawing for this purpose not only on the usual Brahmanical sources but also on the works of the Kashmirian Śākta-Śaivas, quoting the *Īśvarapratyabhijñānārikā* of Utpaladeva and the *Bodhapañcadaśikā* and *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta, though without identifying the authors or works by name. In the 16th century Appayya Dīkṣita wrote the *Śivārkamaṇidīpikā*, an elaborate commentary on this work, and an independent treatise, the *Śivādvaitanirṇaya*, in which he contended that Nilakaṇṭha's doctrine is ultimately indistinguishable from the pure nondualism (*śuddhādvaita*) of the Smārtas. This interpretation is implausible and it was not universally accepted: it was resisted by Brahmayādhavarindra in his *Vedāntasarvasvaśivadarpaṇa*. But whatever the truth of this, we learn that it was possible at this time to be a Saiddhāntika in one's ritual life while adhering to Smārta orthodoxy in one's metaphysics. For Appayya Dīkṣita, as we have seen above, was also the author of an exhaustive Saiddhāntika Paddhati, the *Śivārcanacandrikā*.

## Nonprescriptive Evidence

In this survey of the Śaiva literature I hope to have shown something of the richness and diversity of our surviving textual record and its great range both in time and geographical distribution. But I cannot end without pointing to this record's limitations as evidence of the traditions that produced it. The foremost of these is that the sources are almost entirely prescriptive. This means that they tell Śaivas what to do and what to think (and sometimes why they should do so) but disclose very little about the prevalence of the practices

and beliefs that they advocate, of where or when they originated, of where and when they spread, or of the institutional infrastructure and patronage that enabled and sustained these developments. Anyone undertaking the study of this literature with an historian's perspective should be aware of this problem and work towards its alleviation by confronting the texts with various forms of non-prescriptive evidence.

Some of this evidence is to be found within the texts themselves, especially in those of professed human authorship, in the form of accounts of lineages and institutional affiliations and in reports of what other groups were actually doing and thinking. There is also a certain amount of information that can be gleaned outside the Śaiva literature, from portrayals of Śaivas in dramas, historical Kāvya, local chronicles, satirical works, narrative fiction, and reports of their practices and beliefs in non-Śaiva religious literature.

But we also have nonliterary evidence. We have the material evidence provided by what survives of temples, monasteries, and images of deities in the various regions; we have ethnographic records of Śaiva groups from the 19th century onwards; and above all we have the evidence of the very numerous inscriptions on stone and copper plates found in the subcontinent and Southeast Asia that record donations made by rulers and others to religious beneficiaries, establishing temples and installing deities, and providing endowments to finance their worship and the support of ascetics and priests. These data, material, ethnographic, and epigraphic, enable us to learn much more than the prescriptive texts reveal about the date, spread, and patronage of the Śaiva movements in India and beyond, to gain insight into their relative strength in various regions and periods, and to see important elements of these traditions and their institutions that are not mentioned in the prescriptive literature or if mentioned are not emphasized, and in some cases to find in our texts evidence whose significance is not evident until the texts are reread in the light of the nonprescriptive record.

The most effective work on the Śaiva record will be that which not only transcends the limitation long prevalent of focus on one artificially constructed territory such as "→ Kashmir Śaivism" or "South Indian Śaivism" to the exclusion of others, not to mention neglect of the position of these coexisting and often cofunctioning traditions in the broader picture of Brahmanical, Buddhist,

and Jaina religion, but also transcends the limitation that has tended to separate those able to read and understand the prescriptive and theoretical literature of religious traditions from those who concentrate their attention on epigraphic and material or ethnographic data. It is only by attempting to encompass all these forms of evidence that we can hope to escape to some extent at least from the limitations of each.

(This essay is essentially Sanderson, 2014, stripped of its extensive annotation and slightly expanded through the incorporation of some material from that annotation. I thank Professors Fujii and Yokochi, the editors of Kyoto University's *Journal of Indological Studies*, in which that study was published, for their kind permission to adapt that publication for this encyclopedia. Readers may consult the original publication for the evidence supporting the main text and for the bibliographical details of the works, primary and secondary, on which it rests.)

## Bibliography

- Blake Michael, R., *The Origins of Viraśaiva Sects: A Typological Analysis of Ritual and Associated Patterns in the Śūnyasampādane*, Delhi, 1992.
- Dhavamony, M., *Love of God According to the Śaiva Siddhānta: A Study in the Mysticism of Theology of Śaivism*, Oxford, 1971.
- Goodall, D., *The Parākhyatantra: A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*, CI 98, Pondicherry, 2004.
- Goodall, D., "Problems of Name and Lineage: Relationships Between South Indian Authors of the 'Śaiva Siddhānta'" (a review of *Somaśambhupaddhati: Rituels dans la tradition śivaïte selon Somaśambhu: Quatrième partie: rituels optionnels: pratiṣṭhā* by H. Brunner-Lachaux), *JRAS* 3/10, 2000, 205–216.
- Goodall, D., *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra: Volume I: chapters 1–6: Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*, PDI 86/1, Pondicherry, 1998.
- Goodall, D., & H. Isaacson, "Workshop on the Nīśvāsataṭṭvasaṃhitā: The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra?", *NNGMCP* 3, 2007, 4–6.
- Goudriaan, T., & S. Gupta, *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*, HIL II/2, Wiesbaden, 1981.
- Hara, M., "Materials for the Study of Pāśupata Śaivism," diss., Harvard University, 1966.
- Mallinson, J., "Nāth Sampradāya," in: K.A. Jacobsen *et al.*, eds., *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism*, vol. III, Leiden, 2011, 409–428.
- Sanderson A., "The Śaiva Literature," *JIS* 24–25, 2014, 1–113.



- Sanderson, A., "The Impact of Inscriptions on the Interpretation of Early Śaiva Literature," *IJJ* 56, 2013, 211–244.
- Sanderson, A., "The Śaiva Age: An Explanation of the Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period," in: S. Einoo, ed., *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, Tokyo, 2009, 41–349.
- Sanderson, A., "The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir," in D. Goodall & A. Padoux, eds., *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, CI 106, Pondicherry, 2007a, 231–442; 551–582.
- Sanderson, A., "Atharvavedins in Tantric Territory: The Āṅgirasakalpa Texts of the Oriya Paippalādins and their Connection with the Trika and the Kālikula, With Critical Editions of the Parājapavidhi, the Parāmantravidhi, and the \*Bhadrakālīmantravidhiprakaraṇa," in: A. Griffiths & A. Smiedchen, eds., *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalāda Śākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*, Aachen, 2007b, 195–311.
- Sanderson, A., "The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate Between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism," *IPA* 26, 2006, 143–217.
- Sanderson, A., "The Śaiva Religion Among the Khmers, Part I," *BĒFEO* 90, 2003, 352–464.
- Sanderson, A., "History Through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras," in: F. Grimal, ed., *Les sources et le temps/ Sources and Time*, PDI 91, Pondicherry, 2001, 1–47.
- Sanderson, A., "Meaning in Tantric Ritual," in: A.M. Blondeau & K. Schipper, eds., *Essais sur le Rituel II: Colloque du Centenaire de la Section des Sciences religieuses de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*, Louvain-Paris, 1995, 15–95.
- Shulman, D.D., *Songs of the Harsh Devotee: The Tēvāram of Cuntaramūrttināyaṇār*, Philadelphia, 1990.
- Shulman, D.D., *Tamil Temple Myths: Sacrifice and Divine Marriage in the South Indian Śaiva Tradition*, Princeton, 1980.
- Slouber, M., "Gāruḍa Medicine: A History of Snakebite and Religious Healing in South Asia," diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2012.
- Stainton, H., "Poetry and Prayer: Stotras in the Religious and Literary History of Kashmir," diss., Columbia University, 2013.
- Törzsök, J., "The Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits: A Critical Edition of Selected Chapters of the Siddhayogeśvarimata(tantra) with Annotated Translation and Analysis," diss., University of Oxford, 1999.
- Vasudeva, S., *The Yoga of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra, Chapters 1–4, 7, 11–17: Critical Edition, Translation and Notes*, CI 97, Pondicherry, 2004.
- Viswanathan Peterson, I., *Poems to Śiva: The Hymns of the Tamil Saints*, Delhi, 1991.
- Watson, A., *The Self's Awareness of Itself: Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Arguments Against the Buddhist Doctrine of No-Self*, DNRL 32, Vienna, 2006.
- Yokochi, Y., *The Skandapurāṇa*, vol. III: *Adhyayas 34.1–61, 53–69: The Vindhyavāsini Cycle*, Groningen, 2013.

ALEXIS SANDERSON